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MISSION STATEMENT

The 18 cities and county government are SANDAG serving as the forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG builds consensus, makes strategic plans, obtains and allocates resources, and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region's quality of life.
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Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Board on any item at the time the Board is considering the item. Speaker’s Slips are located in the rear of the room. Once completed, the slip should be presented to the Clerk of the Board seated at the front table. Public speakers should notify the Clerk of the Board if they have a handout for distribution to Board members. Members of the public also are invited to address the Board on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications. All speakers are limited to three minutes. The SANDAG Board may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

This agenda and related staff reports can be accessed on SANDAG’s Web site at www.sandag.org under Meetings. Public comments regarding the agenda can be forwarded to SANDAG via the e-mail comment form also available on the Web site. E-mail comments should be received no later than noon on the Wednesday preceding the Friday SANDAG Board meeting.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY) or fax (619) 699-1905.

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit.
Phone 1-800-COMMUTE or see www.sdcommute.com for route information.
ITEM #   RECOMMENDATION

1. ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Members of the public shall have the opportunity to address the Board on any issue within the jurisdiction of SANDAG. Anyone desiring to speak shall reserve time by completing a “Request to Speak” form and giving it to the Clerk of the Board prior to speaking. Public speakers should notify the Clerk of the Board if they have a handout for distribution to Board members. Speakers are limited to three minutes. Board members may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

REPORTS


At the special Board of Directors meeting on April 9, 2004, the Board accepted the draft Ordinance and Expenditure Plan for distribution for review and comment purposes. The report provides a summary of the comments received to date. The recommended Board action is adopt Resolution 2004-19, which will result in the adoption of environmental findings, a statement of overriding considerations, and a mitigation monitoring and reporting program consistent with CEQA requirements, and to conduct the first reading of the TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan (Commission Ordinance 04-01), read the title of the Ordinance, and waive further reading, with the second reading and adoption scheduled for the May 28, 2004 meeting.

4. ADJOURNMENT

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

+ next to an agenda item indicates an attachment

Introduction

At the April 9, 2004 meeting, the Board accepted the Draft TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan for distribution for public review and comment. A notice regarding the availability of the draft Ordinance and Expenditure Plan was mailed to over 700 individuals, including all elected officials in the region and representatives of a wide range of groups, organizations, and other interested parties. The entire Ordinance package was also posted to SANDAG’s website.

The TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan, included as Attachment 1 to this report, reflects the direction provided by the Board to date. Changes to the draft Ordinance presented to the Board on April 9, 2004 are shown in a line-in - line-out format. The changes to the language are minor, non-substantive changes based on comments received to date and are intended to clarify certain sections of the Ordinance. Attachments 2-6 are the various materials incorporated by reference in the Ordinance. Changes to these attachments from the versions contained in the April 9, 2004 agenda package are shown in a line-in - line-out as well. Attachment 7 is a summary of the major comments received to date related to the TransNet Extension along with staff responses. Copies of the comments received as of May 6, 2004 have been provided to Board members as well.

The enabling legislation (SB 361, Statutes of 1985) that gives SANDAG, serving as the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission, the authority to place a sales tax measure on the

Recommendation

It is recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors take the following actions:

1. Adopt Resolution 2004-19, including the adoption of environmental findings, a statement of overriding considerations, and a mitigation monitoring and reporting program consistent with CEQA requirements for the extension and expansion of the TransNet tax and adoption of a Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program.

2. Conduct the first reading of the TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan (Commission Ordinance 04-01), read the title of the Ordinance and waive further reading, with the second reading and adoption scheduled for the May 28, 2004 meeting.
ballot requires that a retail transactions and use tax ordinance be adopted by the Commission. The ordinance must include the tax rate being imposed, the purposes for which the funds will be used, and the term during which the tax will be imposed. The ordinance also must contain an expenditure plan including the allocation of revenues for the purposes authorized by law. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires certain actions related to documents like the proposed Ordinance and Expenditure Plan. Resolution 2004-19 and its attachments provide further background and information related to the required environmental findings, which are further described in the Discussion section below.

Discussion

Environmental Findings

In March 2003, the SANDAG Board of Directors adopted Resolution 2003-27 to certify the Environmental Impact Report for the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan, MOBILITY 2030 (State Clearinghouse Number 2002071059). At that time, the Board also adopted environmental findings, statement of overriding considerations, and a mitigation monitoring and reporting program pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. The 2030 RTP and EIR expressly contemplated continued reliance on the TransNet revenue, and an extension of TransNet as a funding measure for transportation system improvements and programs outlined in the 2030 RTP under both the Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario and the Unconstrained Revenue scenario. The TransNet extension does not include projects that were not considered in the 2030 RTP or analyzed in the EIR and it is recommended that the SANDAG Board rely on the previously certified EIR pursuant to CEQA (the EIR can be viewed on SANDAG’s Web site at www.sandag.org). Adoption of Resolution 2004-19 would adopt the environmental findings, statement of overriding considerations, and mitigation monitoring and reporting program.

Summary of Comments

Attachment 7 provides a summary of each of the comments received as of May 6, 2004 and staff responses. Comments received after that date will be distributed at the meeting. Most of the comments received to date have focused on requesting additional funding for one of the major categories of funding proposed in the draft TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan. The draft Ordinance and Expenditure Plan has been developed to provide a balanced program with significant improvements proposed for all transportation modes. Based on the comments received to date, staff is not recommending any major changes to the funding distribution or the specific projects and programs proposed in the draft Ordinance and Expenditure Plan.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments (7)

Key Staff Contact: Craig Scott, (619) 699-1926; csc@sandag.org

Funds are budgeted in Work Element #1102
A RESOLUTION OF THE SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (SANDAG) 
BOARD OF DIRECTORS ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS, A STATEMENT OF 
OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS, AND A MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM 
PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT FOR THE EXTENSION AND 
EXPANSION OF THE TransNet TAX AND ADOPTION OF A REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION 
CONGESTION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

WHEREAS, it has been proposed that SANDAG adopt an Ordinance 04-___, entitled 
San Diego County Transportation Improvement Program Ordinance and Expenditure Plan, 
providing for the extension of the TransNet tax from 2008 through 2048, subject to the approval of 
the voters of San Diego County; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Ordinance also provides, subject to voter approval, for expansion 
of the projects and programs that may be funded through TransNet tax revenues, including the 
distribution of funds to local jurisdictions for local transportation system improvements and 
program that are consistent with the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), expenditures for 
necessary administrative costs, planning and feasibility studies, and the costs of environmental 
mitigation and improvement programs undertaken in connection with major transportation 
 improvement projects; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Ordinance also provides for the adoption of a Regional 
Transportation Congestion Improvement Program (“RTCIP”) to provide an additional source of 
funding for the Regional Arterial System and related improvements planned in the 2030 RTP, which 
source consists of contributions from local governments in the amount of $2,000 (as adjusted for 
inflation) per new residential unit constructed within each jurisdiction, subject to exemptions for 
new residences for low- and very low-income families; and

WHEREAS, SANDAG has adopted a 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (herein “2030 RTP,” 
also known as “MOBILITY 2030 - The Transportation Plan for the San Diego Region”) proposing 
various transportation system improvements and programs to improve mobility for all citizens of 
San Diego County; and

WHEREAS, the extension of the TransNet tax was specifically contemplated as one of the 
funding mechanisms necessary to implement the transportation programs and improvements 
proposed under the “Reasonably Expected Revenue” and “Unconstrained Revenue” scenarios 
contemplated in the 2030 RTP, and

WHEREAS, the 2030 RTP also specifically contemplated continued contributions from the 
general funds or other funds of local governments to provide a significant share of the funding for 
regional transportation improvements and related local improvements; and
WHEREAS, the proposed Ordinance contains a list of specific transportation improvement projects and programs that will be funded in whole or in part by revenues from the TransNet tax extension, and all such projects are planned or proposed in the 2030 RTP and are consistent with the 2030 RTP; and

WHEREAS, funds derived from the RTCIP will be used exclusively to fund the Regional Arterial System and related transportation system improvements planned in the 2030 RTP;

NOW THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED that, pursuant to SANDAG’s responsibilities as the lead agency for the proposed Ordinance pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) (Public Resources Code §21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations §15000 et seq.), the SANDAG Board of Directors has been presented with, heard, reviewed, and considered all of the information and data in the administrative record, as more fully described below, and all oral and written evidence presented to it during all meetings and hearings, and based on such information makes the following findings:

1. On March 28, 2003, the SANDAG Board of Directors adopted Resolution 2003-27, adopting the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (“2030 RTP”), also known as “MOBILITY 2030 - The Transportation Plan for the San Diego Region.” The 2030 RTP consists of a program of transportation management policies and proposed roadway, rail system, and other transportation system improvements and programs designed to improve mobility and the overall quality of transportation services within the San Diego region.

2. In connection with review and approval of the 2030 RTP, a Final Environmental Impact Report for the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan, State Clearinghouse No. 2002071059 (the “Program EIR”) was prepared and certified by the SANDAG Board of Directors on March 28, 2003. The Program EIR was prepared and certified as a program EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15168.

3. The Program EIR examined all reasonably foreseeable significant environmental effects of the adoption and implementation of the 2030 RTP, including direct and indirect environmental impacts, cumulative environmental impacts, and growth-inducing impacts of the 2030 RTP and all transportation system improvements and programs proposed in the 2030 RTP. The Program EIR also identified and evaluated mitigation measures to reduce the significant environmental effects of adoption and implementation of the 2030 RTP and related transportation programs and improvements, and analyzed alternatives to the proposed 2030 RTP that might feasibly reduce one or more significant effects of the 2030 RTP. The Program EIR also acknowledged that appropriate further environmental review would be conducted for individual transportation improvement projects listed in the 2030 RTP at the time such projects were actually proposed for implementation, and when plans for these projects were sufficiently developed to permit analysis of the site-specific environmental impacts, mitigation measures, and alternatives for these individual improvement projects.

4. The 2030 RTP expressly contemplated continued reliance on the TransNet tax, and an extension of the TransNet tax as a funding measure for the transportation system improvements and programs proposed in the 2030 RTP under both the “Reasonably Expected Revenue” scenario and the “Unconstrained Revenue” scenario contemplated in the 2030 RTP.
5. The 2030 RTP also expressly contemplated continued reliance on funds from local governments as a source of a significant share of the funding required to fund transportation system improvements and programs proposed in the 2030 RTP under the “Reasonably Expected Revenue” scenario and the “Unconstrained Revenue” scenario.

6. The extension and future collection of the TransNet tax will not in and of itself have any effect, significant or otherwise, on the environment. In addition, no significant environmental effects will result from the expenditure of future TransNet tax revenues on planning and feasibility studies or administrative expenses associated with implementation of the Ordinance or the 2030 RTP. The only potential significant environmental effects of extension of the TransNet tax will result from future expenditures of funds collected through the TransNet tax on implementation of individual transportation improvement projects and programs funded with TransNet tax revenues.

7. The Ordinance provides for adoption of an Expenditure Plan governing the regional and local transportation improvements and programs that may be funded through the extension of the TransNet tax, and includes a specific list of regional transportation improvements and programs that may be included in the Expenditure Plan. All of the listed projects and programs are planned in the 2030 RTP. However, the exact amount and timing of the allocation of funds to such projects is not currently known. In addition, the actual construction plans for the physical transportation system improvements planned in the 2030 RTP and listed in the Ordinance have not presently been developed. To the extent currently possible given the current conceptual nature of the listed proposed transportation system improvements and programs, the foreseeable direct, indirect, cumulative, and growth-inducing environmental impacts of these proposed transportation improvements and programs, along with mitigation measures and feasible alternatives to reduce these impacts, are analyzed in the Program EIR. Further evaluation of the potential environmental impacts, mitigation measures, and alternatives for these proposed transportation system improvements and programs will not be feasible until more detailed plans for implementation of these proposals have been developed.

8. Commencing as of its operative date in 2008, the RTCIP will provide an additional funding mechanism for the Regional Arterial System and related regional transportation facilities planned in the 2030 RTP. However, the exact amount and timing of the allocation of funds to such projects is not currently known. In addition the actual construction plans for the transportation system improvements planned in the 2030 RTP have not presently been developed. To the extent currently possible given the current conceptual nature of the proposed transportation system improvements and programs in the 2030 RTP, the foreseeable direct, indirect, cumulative, and growth-inducing environmental impacts of these proposed regional transportation improvements, along with mitigation measures and feasible alternatives to reduce these impacts, are analyzed in the Program EIR. Further evaluation of the potential environmental impacts, mitigation measures, and alternatives for these proposed transportation system improvements and programs will not be feasible until more detailed plans for implementation of these proposals have been developed.

9. As provided in the Program EIR, further project-specific environmental review will occur pursuant to CEQA prior to the time individual transportation system improvement projects and programs proposed in the 2030 RTP are proposed for actual approval and implementation. In the event that funds from the TransNet tax extension or RTCIP are eventually used to fund any project or program not currently included in the 2030 RTP, project-specific review of such future projects or programs would also occur at the time of an amendment to include such project or
programs in the RTP or, if no CEQA review is required at that time, prior to the time any actual commitment of funds were made by SANDAG or other agencies toward the construction or implementation of such projects or programs.

10. Neither the SANDAG Board of Directors nor SANDAG staff has received any new or additional information since the certification of the Program EIR that indicates that the transportation improvements planned in the 2030 RTP will, either individually or collectively, have any significant environmental impact not identified in the Program EIR, or that any significant environmental effects discussed in the Program EIR will be substantially more severe than disclosed in the Program EIR. In addition, neither the SANDAG Board of Directors nor SANDAG staff have received any new or additional information since the certification of the Program EIR that indicates that any mitigation measures or alternatives deemed infeasible at the time of certification of the Program EIR have now become feasible, or that new or additional feasible mitigation measures or alternatives have become available that are considerably different than those analyzed in the Program EIR and that would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the planned transportation improvements.

11. The Board recognizes that the TransNet tax extension and RTCIP will remain in effect past the current horizon date of the 2030 RTP, and that the 2030 RTP and the Expenditure Plan in the Ordinance are subject to amendment to include new or additional projects or programs that are not presently included in the 2030 RTP or a successor RTP. In addition, it is understood that proposed projects or programs contemplated in the 2030 RTP could in the future be changed or modified prior to completion on the basis of new information, changes in circumstances, or other presently unforeseen causes. The SANDAG Board of Directors also recognizes that funds will be allocated to local governments for local transportation-related projects or programs that are consistent with the adopted RTP but that were not specifically identified or evaluated for potential environmental effects in connection with the adoption of the 2030 RTP. In all of the above cases, the actual nature, location, and possible impacts of all the possible future regional or local projects or programs, or modified projects or programs, are presently unknown and cannot feasibly be determined at the present time.

12. The primary purpose of the proposed TransNet tax extension and RTCIP provided for in the Ordinance is to provide funding for regional transportation improvement projects and programs planned or proposed in the 2030 RTP. However, the Board recognizes that an additional purpose of the 40-year extension of the TransNet tax and adoption of the RTCIP is to create a long-term funding mechanism for transportation system improvements and programs that will extend past the planning horizon of the 2030 RTP and that may be used to fund future projects that are not currently proposed or planned in the 2030 RTP. In addition, it is understood that proposed projects or programs contemplated in the 2030 RTP could in the future be changed or modified prior to completion on the basis of new information, changes in circumstances, or other presently unforeseen causes. The Ordinance is also intended to provide, in part, for the distribution of some TransNet funds to local jurisdictions to fund local street and road maintenance, repairs and improvements, and other local transportation-related projects undertaken directly by local governments that are consistent with the 2030 RTP (or any successor RTP), but may not be directly proposed or planned in the 2030 RTP. To the extent that the Ordinance creates a funding mechanism for such future regional or local improvement projects or programs that are not currently proposed in the 2030 RTP, the adoption of the Ordinance does not constitute a project within the meaning of CEQA as provided in CEQA Guidelines §15378(b)(4). Further, as a practical matter the actual nature of these future projects or programs and their potential environmental
effects, mitigation measures, and alternatives cannot presently be determined with sufficient certainty to permit meaningful environmental review at this time. In the event that the Ordinance and/or the Expenditure Plan in the Ordinance, or the 2030 RTP or any successor RTP, are amended to add additional transportation improvement projects or programs that may be funded in whole or in part with revenue from the TransNet tax extension or RTCIP, any required CEQA review of the potential environmental effects, mitigation measures, alternatives, and other information required by CEQA will be conducted for each such project in connection with the future adoption or amendment of the RTP and/or prior to actual implementation of each such additional transportation improvement project or program. With respect to any local project or program funded through the TransNet tax extension, the local government responsible for carrying out the project shall be responsible for conducting any environmental review required by CEQA prior to implementation of the project or program.

13. In considering its decision to approve the Ordinance and direct its placement on the ballot for approval or rejection by the electorate, the SANDAG Board of Directors has fully reconsidered the information contained in the Program EIR and all other information in the administrative record.

14. Based on the Program EIR and all other information presented to the SANDAG Board of Directors, the Board finds and concludes:

a. The extension of the TransNet tax is an activity contemplated by the 2030 RTP and is and within the scope of study of the Program EIR certified on March 28, 2003.

b. The 2030 RTP and Program EIR also contemplated reliance on general fund revenues or other revenues obtained by local jurisdictions as one of the sources of funding for regional transportation improvement projects and programs proposed in the 2030 RTP, as well as a source of funds for local transportation-related programs and transportation system improvements. The RTCIP will provide an alternate mechanism for generating and securing revenue from local jurisdictions for funding of the Regional Arterial System and related regional transportation system improvements planned in the 2030 RTP and considered in the Program EIR.

c. The sole foreseeable environmental impacts that may result from the adoption and implementation of the Ordinance are the potential impacts associated with construction or implementation of various transportation system improvements and programs which may be funded through the extension of the TransNet tax or through the RTCIP.

d. All potential environmental effects, including cumulative and growth-inducing effects, of the transportation improvements and programs proposed in the 2030 RTP, as well as all appropriate mitigation measures and alternatives that may reduce these effects, are analyzed and disclosed to the extent currently ascertainable in the Program EIR certified on March 28, 2003.

e. SANDAG has received no significant new information requiring or justifying preparation of a supplemental or subsequent EIR for the extension of the TransNet tax pursuant to Public Resources Code §21166 and CEQA Guidelines §15162.
f. To the extent that the TransNet tax extension and RTCIP will provide a funding mechanism for projects that are not currently proposed or planned in the 2030 RTP, including projects or programs planned or implemented after the expiration of the 2030 RTP, projects or programs added to the 2030 RTP by future amendments, and local projects or programs not currently contemplated in the 2030 RTP that may be funded through the TransNet tax extension, or any other possible future program or project not currently known to or planned by SANDAG, the approval of the Ordinance by SANDAG and placement of the Ordinance on the ballot do not constitute a project or projects for purposes of CEQA pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15378(b)(4), and therefore do not require preparation of a negative declaration or environmental impact report addressing possible impacts of enactment of the TransNet tax extension or adoption of the RTCIP.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that pursuant to Public Resources Code §21081 and CEQA Guidelines §15091, the SANDAG Board of Directors adopts the findings attached hereto as Attachment 1.A, previously adopted for the 2030 RTP, a true copy of which is attached hereto and incorporated fully herein by this reference, concerning the foreseeable environmental impacts, mitigation measures, and alternatives to the proposed project.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the SANDAG Board of Directors has considered the potential benefits of the Ordinance and weighed those benefits against the potential unavoidable environmental impacts associated with the Ordinance, and concluded that the potential benefits override and outweigh the foreseeable unavoidable impacts as more particularly set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations attached as Attachment 1.B and fully incorporated herein.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that pursuant to Public Resources Code §21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines §15097, the SANDAG Board of Directors adopts the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program previously adopted for the 2030 RTP, a true copy of which is attached hereto as Attachment 1.C and incorporated by reference, and that provides for monitoring and reporting of all mitigation measures adopted in connection with approval of the 2030 RTP, as the mitigation monitoring and reporting program for the adoption of the Ordinance.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 14th day of May, 2004.
ATTACHMENT 1A

SECTION I

FINDINGS REGARDING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) Board of Directors hereby finds that the following environmental impacts of the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) are less than significant. Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant (California Code of Regulations Title 14, §15126.4(a)(3)).

A. Land Use

Land Use Patterns

Land use patterns along key transportation corridors currently reflect the presence of existing facilities. Typically, along much of these existing key corridors, there is not a substantial quantity of adjacent undisturbed/vacant land, and projects would be compatible with existing or planned adjacent land uses when accommodated with the existing rights-of-way. No significant incompatibilities with land use patterns are expected.

Planned Land Uses

The 2030 RTP is developed on the premise that future growth would be shifted away from the low-density unincorporated areas of the county and intensified within the already developed cities within the region. Three key jurisdictions, the County of San Diego, the City of San Diego, and the City of Chula Vista are currently revising their general plans to incorporate smart growth elements. The 2030 RTP was developed with input from each of the local jurisdictions and represents trends in smart growth planning in the region. The 2030 RTP will have to continually be evaluated against land use changes that occur in local jurisdictions and respond to those changes accordingly. No significant inconsistencies with local land use plans are anticipated.

B. Social Environment

The goals, policies, and actions of the 2030 RTP center around incentives for encouraging alternative commuter travel choices, such as a better managed, more efficient use of the existing road network and a greatly enhanced transit system. The 2030 RTP would provide for a more efficient transportation network that allows for better movement of people between major work, housing, and school routes. The enhanced transportation system would be a socioeconomic benefit.

C. Visual Resources

Construction of projects could result in short-term view blockage. Even with typical best management practices, short-term visual impacts are often unavoidable; however, these impacts are
temporary and would last only throughout the duration of the construction activities. Short-term construction impacts are considered less than significant.

D. Traffic/Circulation

Regional Transportation System

While future conditions would inevitably include increased population and vehicle travel, implementation of the 2030 RTP would result in a less congested roadway system and a more accessible transit system than the “No Project” condition. At the program level, the 2030 RTP is considered to be beneficial in terms of its impact on the regional transportation system. No significant traffic/circulation impacts would result.

Cumulative Traffic

The purpose of the proposed 2030 RTP is to optimize the performance of the roadway and public transit systems as the region continues to grow and develop. Implementation of the project is expected to result in a less congested roadway network, increased public transportation opportunities, and expanded bikeway corridors. At the program level, the project is considered to be beneficial to the regional transportation system and would not add to cumulative adverse traffic impacts across the San Diego region.

E. Air Quality

Air Pollution

Actions and policies of the 2030 RTP would benefit the region’s air quality by helping to relieve traffic congestion and by encouraging the use of more efficient transportation methods. The future smart growth land use pattern assumed under the 2030 RTP would support mixed-use and denser development supporting alternative modes of transit such as walking or bicycling. The 2030 RTP would contribute positively to the purpose of the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for the attainment of the Regional Air Quality Standards (RAQS). No significant adverse impacts to regional air quality would result from implementation of the 2030 RTP.

Cumulative Air Quality

The 2030 RTP outlines projects that would act to reduce vehicular emissions, such as highway expansions, traffic signal improvements, transit expansion and increased operations, vanpools, high-occupancy-vehicle (HOV) lanes, park-and-ride opportunities, and regional bike/pedestrian paths. Proposed RTP improvements to the region’s transportation network would be consistent with the RAQS and SIP. Although other past, present, and future projects would contribute to significant cumulative air quality impacts and the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB) would remain in nonconformity for some emissions, the 2030 RTP would act to minimize, not increase, air quality emissions. The smog-forming pollutants (tons/day) would be less with the project than with the “No Project” condition. The 2030 RTP would therefore not be considered a contributor to significant cumulative air quality impacts in the SDAB.
F. **Energy**

**Energy Consumption**

The estimated future increase in population, along with the related increase in vehicle travel, would result in an increase in energy consumption. The 2030 RTP would, however, improve traffic flows and provide greater transit choices. These factors would work to offset the future increase in energy consumption, but there would still be a future fuel consumption increase of 1.7 percent over the No Project condition. This projected 1.7 percent increase is less than the 5 percent significance threshold and would not result in a significant energy consumption impact.

**Energy Efficiency**

Proposed transit improvements in the 2030 RTP would encourage optimized use of public transportation through new routes and increased operations. Public transportation provides a more energy-efficient mode of travel than a single-passenger vehicle. Reduction in traffic congestion through 2030 RTP projects would also allow for more energy-efficient vehicular travel. The 2030 RTP would result in positive benefits toward increasing energy efficiency.

**Cumulative Energy**

The purpose of the 2030 RTP is to develop a regional transportation network that would operate efficiently and encourage the use of transit as the San Diego area continues to grow. Though some new project development outlined in the 2030 RTP would increase energy consumption, the 2030 RTP outlines projects that would create new or improved highways that reduce traffic congestion, facilitate smoother traffic flows, and provide routes that are more direct. Proposed transit improvements in the 2030 RTP also encourage optimized use of public transportation, which provides a more energy-efficient mode of travel than single-passenger vehicles, thereby reducing the region’s transportation energy consumption rate. For these reasons, the 2030 RTP would not increase cumulative energy impacts.

G. **Environmental Justice**

The 2030 RTP would provide an equitable level of service for both minority and low-income populations. No disproportionate adverse impacts related to equity of service would occur to the low-income and minority populations identified for the San Diego region. Therefore, no significant environmental justice impact would occur with implementation of the 2030 RTP.
SECTION II
FINDINGS REGARDING SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS
MITIGATED TO A LEVEL LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

The SANDAG Board of Directors hereby finds that mitigation measures have been identified in the Draft EIR that will avoid or substantially lessen the following potentially significant environmental impacts to a less than significant level. The potentially significant impacts and the mitigation measures that will reduce them to a less than significant level are as follows.

A. Land Use

Resource Lands

Significant Impacts

Where new facilities would be constructed outside of the currently urbanized core, undisturbed/vacant land could be utilized for transportation purposes. Those lands may have historically been or are currently being used for agriculture, and/or some may be planned for the Multiple Habitat Conservation Program (MHCP) or the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) open space preserves. The possible conversion of these resource lands may be potentially significant in selected areas.

Mitigation

The following mitigation measures are found in Section 4.1.5 of the EIR:

LU-1 For projects in agricultural areas, project implementation agencies shall contact the California Department of Conservation and the San Diego Agricultural Commissioner’s office to identify the location of prime farmlands and lands that support crops considered valuable to the local or regional economy. Impacts to such lands shall be evaluated in project-specific environmental documents. The analysis shall use the land use evaluation and site assessment (LESA) analysis method (CEQA Guidelines §21095), as appropriate. The project implementation agencies or local jurisdiction shall be responsible for ensuring adherence to the mitigation measures prior to construction. Mitigation measures may include conservation easements or payment in lieu of fees.

LU-2 Project implementation agencies shall identify open space areas that could be preserved and shall include mitigation measures (such as dedication or payment in lieu of fees) for the loss of open space.

Finding

For the potentially significant impact to agricultural open space lands, the Finding is made that the changes or alterations as set forth in mitigation measures LU-1 and LU-2 have been required in, or incorporated into, the 2030 RTP that avoid or significantly lessen significant environmental effects. As stated in Section 4.1.6 of the EIR, mitigation measures are anticipated to reduce the quantity and
severity of the loss to resource lands, including open space and agricultural resources, to below a level of significance at this planning level stage of analysis.

Cumulative Land Use Effects

**Significant Impacts**

Cumulatively significant impacts could result from projects associated with the implementation of the 2030 RTP plus other development and roadway projects. Significant impacts would occur if these projects were not in conformance with the adopted land use plan or zoning requirements.

**Mitigation**

The 2030 RTP would include implementation of sensitive design measures, including provision of buffers between incompatible land uses, changes to the adopted plan and zone, or implementation of other mitigation measures identified for specific project actions on a case-by-case basis as described in Section 5.1 of the EIR and listed above.

**Finding**

For the cumulatively significant land use impacts that could potentially occur, the Finding is made that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects. Project-specific mitigation measures, such as buffers between incompatible land uses, changes to the adopted plan and zone, or implementation of other such measures would mitigate potential land use impacts to less than significant. The change or alteration is within the responsibility of other public agencies (e.g., the California Department of Transportation [Caltrans] or other jurisdictions) and not the agency making the Findings (SANDAG). Such changes can be adopted by those jurisdictions.

B. **Social Environment**

Displacement

**Significant Impacts**

Certain transportation improvements, such as highway widening, new highway construction, and increased right-of-way for transit improvements, may potentially displace existing residences or businesses in some areas. Transportation improvements that require displacement of residences or businesses would represent a significant adverse impact.

**Mitigation**

The following mitigation measure is found in Section 4.2.5 of the EIR:

Social-1 Significant adverse impacts resulting from displacement of residents or businesses shall be mitigated with specific relocation measures as dictated by local, state, or federal requirements. Such measures include assistance in finding a new location, assistance with moving, or compensation for losses. Where it has been determined that displacement is necessary and displaced individuals are eligible, a relocation assistance
program consistent with the State Uniform Location Assistance and Real Properties Acquisition Policies Act provides compensation and assistance in finding new residences for displaced individuals.

Finding

For the significant impacts resulting from displacement of residences or businesses, the Finding is made that changes or alterations as set forth in mitigation measure Social-1 have been required in, or incorporated into, the 2030 RTP that avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects. As stated in Section 4.2.6 of the EIR, specific relocation procedures would reduce impacts from relocation, and displacement impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance. The change or alteration is within the responsibility of other public agencies (e.g., Caltrans or other jurisdictions) and not the agency making the Findings (SANDAG). Such changes can be adopted by those jurisdictions.

Cumulative Social Environment

Significant Impacts

Cumulative development of the 2030 RTP plus other projects would not result in substantial, unanticipated increases in population beyond those currently projected. However, new construction and/or right-of-way acquisition associated with the combined projects could result in cumulative displacement impacts to residences and/or businesses.

Mitigation

No mitigation is provided at this program level; however, project-specific measures such as relocation assistance programs would mitigate any cumulative impacts associated with displacement. This mitigation is outlined above as Social-1 and can be found in Section 4.2.5 of the EIR.

Finding

For the significant cumulative impacts resulting from the displacement of residences or businesses, the Finding is made that changes or alterations as set forth in mitigation measure Social-1 have been required in, or incorporated into, the 2030 RTP that avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects. As stated in Section 5.1 of the EIR, specific relocation procedures would reduce impacts from relocation and displacement impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance. The change or alteration is within the responsibility of other public agencies (e.g., Caltrans or other jurisdictions) and not the agency making the Findings (SANDAG). Such changes can be adopted by those jurisdictions.
C. **Noise**

**Increased Noise Levels**

**Significant Impacts**

Proposed transit, arterial, highway, and freeway improvements have the potential to significantly impact the local noise environment if sensitive receptors are located nearby. The 2030 RTP would result in faster-moving traffic and increased operation of buses and trains; however, this would generate more noise than slow-moving, single-passenger cars. The development of mixed land uses around transit corridors, specifically associated with rail activity, could expose more people to the higher levels of noise generated by high-volume transit corridors.

**Mitigation**

The following mitigation measures are found in Section 4.6.5 of the EIR:

- State and local jurisdictions have established noise standards and guidelines depending upon the types of land uses. The detailed noise effects of new and improved transportation facilities recommended in the 2030 RTP would be addressed in required project-specific acoustical studies and incorporated into environmental documents and required permits. The following measures shall be required of all such projects:
  - **Noi-1** Alignments of transportation corridors shall consider noise sensitive areas and reduce noise levels by maximizing distance to sensitive receptors (human or wildlife), and using depressed rights-of-way, berms, or sound barrier walls to reduce noise where feasible.
  - **Noi-2** Land use measures such as zoning designations shall be employed for future development on land adjacent to transportation facilities.
  - **Noi-3** Where other methods are impractical, operational constraints shall be imposed to the greatest extent feasible (e.g., limits on vehicle speed, regulation of train horns).
  - **Noi-4** Site-specific and project-specific environmental assessment shall be needed for individual transit projects when they are proposed. Noise impacts may be avoided by careful siting of facilities and the use of noise-reducing berms, walls, or other barriers.

**Finding**

For the potentially significant impacts resulting from increased noise near areas of sensitive receivers, the finding is made that changes or alterations as set forth in mitigation measures Noi-1 through Noi-4 have been required in, or incorporated into, the 2030 RTP that avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects. As stated in Section 4.6.6 of the EIR, implementation of the above measures on project-specific projects would mitigate noise impacts to below a level of significance. The change or alteration is within the responsibility of other public agencies (e.g., Caltrans or other jurisdictions) and not the agency making the Findings (SANDAG). Such changes can be adopted by those jurisdictions.
Cumulative Noise

**Significant Impacts**

Highway and transit improvements would contribute to increased noise levels within the transportation corridor used by each of the modes and an incremental increase to noise levels within the region. Furthermore, decreasing highway congestion, which is a goal of the 2030 RTP, would allow vehicular traffic on freeways and major arterials to move faster. Because noise levels have been found to increase with the speed of passing traffic, programs that reduce the number of vehicles using a corridor, or allow for higher speed, could increase the noise produced by traffic and exceed significance thresholds.

**Mitigation**

Cumulative significant exterior noise impacts to existing and future sensitive receptors could be reduced or avoided by the mitigation measures listed in the above noise section and are found in Section 4.6.5 of the EIR.

**Finding**

For the potentially significant cumulative noise impacts resulting from increased noise near areas of sensitive receivers, the Finding is made that changes or alterations as set forth in mitigation measures Noi-1, Noi-2, Noi-3, and Noi-4 have been required in, or incorporated into, the 2030 RTP that avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects. As stated in Section 5.1 in the EIR, application of the above measures would mitigate cumulative noise impacts to below a level of significance. The change or alteration is within the responsibility of other public agencies (e.g., Caltrans or other jurisdictions) and not the agency making Findings (SANDAG). Such changes can be adopted by those jurisdictions.

D. **Geology/Paleontology**

**Geologic Stability**

**Significant Impacts**

The entire San Diego region is susceptible to impacts from seismic activity and portions of the region are located in geologic formations susceptible to slope failure. New transportation facilities would be exposed to both direct and indirect effects of earthquakes and slope failure. This would be a potentially significant impact.

**Mitigation**

It should be noted that all projects shall adhere to the State of California design standards and all typical design, grading, and construction practices to avoid or reduce geologic hazards. The following mitigation measure is found in Section 4.8.5 of the EIR:

Geo-1 Regulatory agencies with oversight on transit and transportation projects have developed engineering design specifications for freeway/highway/rail and other transit projects to consider and compensate for site-level geologic and seismic conditions. All
site designs shall be reviewed and approved by the appropriate agency, such as the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Caltrans, Federal Transit Administration, etc.

Finding

For the potentially significant impacts resulting from exposure to unstable geological conditions, the Finding is made that the changes or alterations as set forth in mitigation measure Geo-1 have been required in, or incorporated into, the 2030 RTP that avoid or significantly lessen significant environmental effects. As stated in Section 4.8.6 of the EIR, this mitigation measure is anticipated to reduce impacts due to seismic exposure and slope failure to below a level of significance. The change or alteration is within the responsibility of other public agencies (e.g., Caltrans or other jurisdictions) and not the agency making the Findings (SANDAG). Such changes can be adopted by those jurisdictions.

Cumulative Geology

Significant Impacts

The entire San Diego region is susceptible to impacts from seismic activity. Portions of the 2030 RTP transportation network and many other cumulative projects would be constructed through geologic formations susceptible to slope failure. Projects proposed in the 2030 RTP would increase potential hazards from geological instability.

Mitigation

Earthquake-resistant designs employed on new structures minimize the impact to public safety from seismic events. Project-specific geotechnical investigations would be necessary to design measures to avoid slope failure. As such, all projects, both proposed in the 2030 RTP and throughout the region, are required to meet certain safety design features that reduce potential geological impacts. Highway and freeway projects would also incorporate mitigation as outlined in the geology section above as found in Section 4.8.5 of the EIR.

Finding

For the potentially significant cumulative geologic impacts, the Finding is made that the changes or alterations as set forth in the 2030 RTP geologic mitigation measures have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or significantly lessen significant environmental effects. As stated in Section 5.1 of the EIR, this mitigation measure is anticipated to reduce cumulative impacts due to seismic exposure and slope failure to below a level of significance.

Paleontological Resources

Significant Impacts

Implementation of the 2030 RTP would result in transportation facilities being constructed within geological formations with moderate to high paleontological resource potential. The potential for impacts to paleontological resources is considered significant.
Mitigation

The following mitigation measure is found in Section 4.8.5 of the EIR:

Paleo-1 In general, when a transportation construction project involves known fossil-bearing rocks, qualified researchers are stationed on-site to observe during grading and to recover scientifically valuable specimens. A certified paleontologist shall be retained by the project-implementing agency prior to construction to establish procedures for surveillance and the pre-construction salvage of exposed resources if fossil-bearing rocks have the potential to be impacted. The monitor shall provide pre-construction coordination with contractors, oversee original cutting in previously undisturbed areas of sensitive formations, halt or redirect construction activities as appropriate to allow recovery of newly discovered fossil remains, and oversee fossil salvage operations and reporting.

Finding

For the potentially significant impacts resulting from construction of transportation facilities within geologic formations with a moderate to high potential for paleontological resources, the Finding is made that the changes or alterations as set forth in mitigation measure Paleo-1 have been required in, or incorporated into, the 2030 RTP that avoid or significantly lessen significant environmental effects. As stated in Section 4.8.6 of the EIR, the monitoring required as mitigation would ensure that paleontological impacts are reduced to below a level of significance. The change or alteration is within the responsibility of other public agencies (e.g., Caltrans or other jurisdictions) and not the agency making the Findings (SANDAG). Such changes can be adopted by those jurisdictions.

Cumulative Paleontological Resources

Significant Impacts

The implementation of the 2030 RTP and other regional projects would result in disturbance of geologic formations with moderate to high paleontological resource potential through the San Diego area. At the program level, cumulative impacts to paleontological resources are considered potentially significant.

Mitigation

As outlined above in the Paleontological Resources section, paleontological surveys would be required at the project-specific level to determine the resource value for impacted areas. Monitoring by a qualified paleontologist would also be a project-specific requirement in all those project areas where any grading would occur in formations of moderate to high resource potential and would reduce any cumulative impacts to regional paleontological resources. This mitigation can be found in Section 4.8.5 of the EIR.

Finding

For the potentially significant cumulative impacts resulting from construction of transportation facilities within geologic formations with a moderate to high potential for paleontological resources, the Finding is made that the changes or alterations as set forth in the 2030 RTP
paleontological resources mitigation measure have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or significantly lessen significant environmental effects. As stated in Section 5.1 of the EIR, the monitoring required as mitigation would ensure that cumulative paleontological impacts are reduced to below a level of significance. The change or alteration is within the responsibility of other public agencies (e.g., Caltrans or other jurisdictions) and not the agency making the Findings (SANDAG). Such changes can be adopted by those jurisdictions.

E. Water Quality

Erosion, Increased Runoff, and Flooding

Significant Impacts

Erosion resulting from construction of projects proposed within the 2030 RTP would potentially contribute to the sediment load in surface waters and could potentially become significant if deposited into a potable water supply, flood control channel, or wetlands. The 2030 RTP would result in new impervious surfaces that would create increased nonpoint source pollution. Runoff from new highways and other transportation facilities are known to carry pollutants. Projects constructed in floodplains may potentially increase flooding hazards.

Mitigation

All new and improved transportation facilities must comply with federal, state, and local policies, standards, and land use strategies that address water resource issues. These would include programs and regulations of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), FHWA, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE), Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), local flood control districts, and other local jurisdictions. In general, compliance with these regulations and permit procedures would be effective in mitigating potential impacts to water resources. Caltrans projects would be required to implement best management practices outlined in their handbooks. Specific measures to address surface water, groundwater, and flooding are provided below.

The following mitigation measures can reasonably be expected to be a part of the design and construction of the 2030 RTP transportation improvements:

Surface Water

Water-1 To the extent feasible, drainage of roadway runoff shall be designed to run through grass median strips, contoured to provide adequate storage capacity and to provide overland flow, detention, and infiltration before it reaches culverts. Detention basins and ponds, aside from controlling runoff rates, can also remove particulate pollutants through settling.

Water-2 Proper erosion control measures shall be implemented during construction and will include measures such as jute netting, straw and chemical mulches, temporary retention ponds, or quick revegetation. Other control measures include limiting the amount of exposed area and preventing construction vehicles and/or equipment from passing through or near natural drainages.
Long-term sediment control shall include an erosion control and revegetation program designed to allow reestablishment of native vegetation on slopes in undeveloped areas.

In areas where habitat for fish and other wildlife would be threatened by transportation facility discharge, alternate drainageways shall be sought to protect sensitive fish and wildlife populations. Heavy-duty sweepers, with disposal of collected debris in sanitary landfills, shall be used to effectively reduce annual pollutant loads. Catch basins and storm drains should be cleaned and maintained on a regular basis.

Detention basins, infiltration strips, and other features to facilitate groundwater recharge shall be incorporated into the design of new freeway and roadway facilities.

Projects shall be designed so that they do not increase downstream flooding risks by substantially increasing peak runoff volumes. This could be achieved by increasing the size of local flood control facilities serving the project areas, increasing bridge span, or by including detention ponds in designs for roadway medians, parking areas, or other facilities.

Projects shall be designed to allow lateral transmission of storm water flows across transportation corridors with no increased risk of upstream flooding. Culverts and bridges shall be designed to adequately carry drainage waters through project sites. The bottom of overpass structures shall be elevated at least 1 foot above the 100-year flood elevation at all stream and drainage channel crossings.

All roadbeds for new highway and rail transit facilities shall be elevated at least 1 foot above the 100-year base flood elevation.

For the potentially significant impacts resulting from increased potential for erosion, surface runoff, and flooding due to construction and operation of the 2030 RTP, the Finding is made that the changes or alterations as set forth in mitigation measures Water-1 through Water-8 have been required in, or incorporated into, the 2030 RTP that avoid or significantly lessen significant environmental effects. As stated in Section 4.9.6 of the EIR, implementation of specific mitigation measures would ensure that potential water quality impacts are reduced to below a level of significance. The change or alteration is within the responsibility of other public agencies (e.g., Caltrans or other jurisdictions) and not the agency making the Findings (SANDAG). Such changes can be adopted by those jurisdictions.
F. Biological Resources

Wildlife Movement and Viability

Significant Impacts

Major roadways may potentially impede the movement of wildlife across the region and habitat fragmentation could substantially impact the long-term viability of wildlife populations in the region.

Mitigation

The following mitigation measures are found in Section 4.10.5 of the EIR:

Bio-1 Design projects to minimize or eliminate impacts to natural habitats and known sensitive species. Large contiguous areas of habitat shall be avoided to the greatest extent feasible to reduce fragmentation of remaining habitat areas. Resource agencies shall be consulted during pre-design stage.

Bio-2 Provide for continued movement of ground-level wildlife across rights-of-way, where there are designated wildlife corridors, through the use of appropriately sized bridges or other openings where roads or transit features would create barriers.

Findings

For the potentially significant impacts to wildlife movement and viability across the region, the Finding is made that the changes or alterations as set forth in mitigation measures Bio-1 and Bio-2 have been required in, or incorporated into, the 2030 RTP that avoid or significantly lessen significant environmental effects. As stated in Section 4.10.6 of the EIR, implementation of the above-listed mitigation measures would ensure that potential impacts to wildlife movement and viability are reduced to below a level of significance. The change or alteration is within the responsibility of other public agencies (e.g., Caltrans or other jurisdictions) and not the agency making the Findings (SANDAG). Such changes can be adopted by those jurisdictions.

Native Habitat and Wildlife

Significant Impacts

Construction of new highways, road widenings, new HOV lanes, or interchanges for existing facilities may directly and/or indirectly impact native habitat and wildlife, including sensitive plant and wildlife species and wetlands. Direct impacts could result from displacement and loss of habitat. Indirect impacts could result from ongoing noise, light, glare, air pollution, and polluted runoff after the facilities are built.
Mitigation

The following mitigation measures are found in Section 4.10.5 of the EIR:

Bio-3 Provide off-site mitigation contiguous with areas of like resources to maximize the biological value of the habitat provided as mitigation. These efforts shall be coordinated with resource agencies and regional habitat conservation and planning efforts such as the MSCP and the MHCP.

Bio-4 Where possible, avoid impacting oak woodlands, vernal pools, estuaries, lagoons, and other regionally and locally significant biotic resources; where unavoidable, replace with equal or better quality habitat to ensure no net loss of the resource.

Bio-5 Where possible, avoid alteration of streambeds and associated riparian vegetation; where unavoidable, replace with like quality or better habitat at a ratio required by regulatory agencies with the goal of no net loss to wetlands.

Bio-6 Preserve open space areas identified in local, state, and federal plans to the greatest extent possible.

Bio-7 Remove only as much vegetation and disturb only as much wildlife habitat as is absolutely necessary for grading. Revegetate with native plants where appropriate. Staging areas shall be located in previously disturbed areas.

Bio-8 Schedule construction to avoid or minimize impacts to wildlife (e.g., avoid breeding season for sensitive species). Project specific review shall define specific mitigation measures, such as berms and sound walls, which would reduce construction and operational noise to within regulatory standards.

Bio-9 Use appropriate water pollution control technology and best management practices to minimize or eliminate impacts to downstream aquatic systems.

Findings

For the potentially significant direct and indirect impacts to native plant and wildlife species, the Finding is made that the changes or alterations as set forth in mitigation measures Bio-3 through Bio-9 have been required in, or incorporated into, the 2030 RTP that avoid or significantly lessen significant environmental effects. As stated in Section 4.10.6 of the EIR, implementation of the above-listed mitigation measures would ensure that potential impacts to native plant and wildlife species are reduced to below a level of significance. The change or alteration is within the responsibility of other public agencies (e.g., Caltrans or other jurisdictions) and not the agency making the Findings (SANDAG). Such changes can be adopted by those jurisdictions.
Cumulative Biological Resources

**Significant Impacts**

Implementation of regional projects would contribute to the cumulative loss of sensitive habitats throughout the San Diego region, along with the projects outlined in the 2030 RTP. Of particular concern are the potential loss of coastal sage scrub; wetlands and associated habitat, lagoons, native and nonnative grasslands; and southern mixed chaparral. The loss of large open blocks of these habitats or resources would contribute to cumulatively significant impacts.

**Mitigation**

The conservation of open space and restoration or enhancement of disturbed habitat provided by implementation of the MSCP, MHCP, and other plan guidelines and mitigation required of proposed projects would serve to lessen these potential cumulative biological impacts to a level below significance. Sensitive resource areas would be managed, restored, and/or revegetated for long-term persistence through implementation of the applicable habitat conservation plan. Implementation of the MSCP and other plans in conjunction with the mitigation measures listed above and found in Section 4.10.5 of the EIR would lessen cumulatively significant impacts to sensitive habitats (except native grasslands) to below a level of significance.

**Finding**

For the potentially significant cumulative impacts to sensitive habitats, the Finding is made that the changes or alterations as set forth in mitigation measures Bio-3 through Bio-9 have been required in, or incorporated into, the 2030 RTP that avoid or significantly lessen significant environmental effects. As stated in Section 5.1 of the EIR, implementation of the above-listed mitigation measures would ensure that potentially significant cumulative impacts to sensitive habitats are reduced to below a level of significance. The change or alteration is within the responsibility of other public agencies (e.g., Caltrans or other jurisdictions) and not the agency making the Findings (SANDAG). Such changes can be adopted by those jurisdictions.

**G. Cultural Resources**

**Prehistoric and Historic Resources**

**Significant Impacts**

Major new transportation projects identified in the 2030 RTP, including highway widening and transit facilities, could impact significant prehistoric or historic properties. Rail alignments, bikeways, border crossings, and transit stations could also impact archaeological sites. Intensification of land uses along established transit corridors in older portion of the cities could result in significant historical impacts where structures of architectural or historical significance may be located.
Mitigation

The following mitigation measures are found in Section 4.11.5 of the EIR:

Cult-1 Where feasible, the project shall implement design measures to avoid archaeological or historical resource areas or areas identified as having significant heritage values to living peoples.

Cult-2 Preservation of important cultural or scientific sites by capping with fill, asphalt, or some other material to preserve their contextual setting shall be considered.

Cult-3 Areas of cultural or scientific resources shall be monitored during the grading phase.

Cult-4 Archaeological and historical resources shall be salvaged through data sample recovery programs.

Cult-5 All specimens collected shall be archived at an appropriate institution.

Findings

For the potentially significant impacts to prehistoric and historic cultural resources, the Finding is made that the changes or alterations as set forth in mitigation measures Cult-1 through Cult-5 have been required in, or incorporated into, the 2030 RTP that avoid or significantly lessen significant environmental effects. As stated in Section 4.11.6 of the EIR, implementation of the above-listed mitigation measures would ensure that potential impacts to cultural resources are reduced to below a level of significance. The change or alteration is within the responsibility of other public agencies (e.g., Caltrans or other jurisdictions) and not the agency making the Findings (SANDAG). Such changes can be adopted by those jurisdictions.

Cumulative Cultural Resources

Significant Impacts

Any loss of historic or prehistoric resources from the combined proposed project and past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, including the 2030 RTP, would contribute to cumulatively significant impacts to cultural resources, depending on location.

Mitigation

Cumulative impacts could be reduced to below a level of significance or avoided by mitigation measures located in Section 4.11.5 of the EIR, along with any mitigation outlined during project-specific analysis.

Finding

For the potentially significant cumulative impacts to prehistoric and historic cultural resources, the Finding is made that the changes or alterations as set forth in mitigation measures Cult-1 through Cult-5 have been required in, or incorporated into, the 2030 RTP that avoid or significantly lessen significant environmental effects. As stated in Section 5.1 of the EIR, implementation of the above-
listed mitigation measures would ensure that potential cumulative impacts to cultural resources are reduced to below a level of significance. The change or alteration is within the responsibility of other public agencies (e.g., Caltrans or other jurisdictions) and not the agency making the Findings (SANDAG). Such changes can be adopted by those jurisdictions.
SECTION III

FINDINGS REGARDING SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS
NOT FULLY MITIGATED TO A LEVEL LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

A. Land Use

Cumulative Land Use

Significant Impacts

Implementation of the 2030 RTP would contribute cumulatively to an incremental increase in the loss of regional open space and agricultural areas. The 2030 RTP is based on an anticipated smart growth future land use pattern; however, certain projects included in the RTP would be located in areas of existing open space and more rural uses. The conversion of this land and loss of regional open space and agricultural lands would be considered cumulatively significant.

Mitigation

To avoid or reduce cumulative loss to agriculture and open space lands, numerous projects of various types (transportation, residential, and commercial) would need to remain unbuilt or reduced substantially in size. This would allow open space and agricultural operations to remain undisturbed; however, those projects are necessary to accommodate planned employment, services, and residential demand, and to provide roads to link these nodes. Many projects, particularly in the eastern part of Chula Vista, such as East Lake and Otay Ranch, have entitlements and have already made Findings and adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations regarding significant and unmitigable impacts to agriculture. There is no feasible mitigation that would reduce the loss of regional open space and agricultural lands and satisfy the purpose and need of the project.

Finding

For the significant cumulative impacts resulting from loss of regional open space and agricultural lands due to projects proposed in the 2030 RTP, the Finding is made that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures. The cumulative loss of open space and agricultural lands would remain significant and unavoidable in the long term.

B. Visual Resources

Long-Term Visual Alterations

Significant Impacts

Potentially significant visual impacts could occur if proposed alignments or facilities require large cut and fill slopes or noise barriers; block views from adjacent areas; or intrude into important vistas along roadways, and/or change the scale, character, and quality of designated or eligible scenic highway corridors. Proposed rail improvements, such as double-tracking in the coastal corridor, could result in significant impacts.
Mitigation

The following mitigation measure is found in Section 4.3.5 of the EIR and would be expected to reduce visual impacts for most projects, but not fully mitigate for all projects at particularly sensitive locations.

Vis-1 Project sponsors shall commit to mitigation measures at the time of certification of their environmental document. Mitigation measures may include:

- Design projects to minimize contrasts in scale and massing between the project and surrounding natural forms and developments. Avoid, if possible, large cuts and fills when the visual environment (natural or urban) would be substantially disrupted. Site or design projects to minimize their intrusion into important viewsheds and use contour grading to better match surrounding terrain.

- Use natural landscaping to minimize contrasts between the project and surrounding areas. Wherever possible, develop interchanges and transit lines at the grade of the surrounding land to limit view blockage. Contour the edges of major cut and fill slopes to provide a more natural looking finished profile.

- Design landscaping along highway corridors to add significant natural elements and visual interest to soften the hard-edged, linear travel experience that would otherwise occur.

- Replace and renew landscaping to the greatest extent possible along corridors with road widenings, interchange projects, and related improvements. Plan landscaping in new corridors to respect existing natural and man-made features and to complement the dominant landscaping of surrounding areas.

- Construct soundwalls of materials whose color and texture complement the surrounding landscape and development. Use color, texture, and alternating facades to “break up” large facades and provide visual interest.

- Where there is room, landscape the soundwalls with plants that screen the soundwall, preferably with either native vegetation or landscaping that complements the dominant landscaping of surrounding areas.

Finding

For the significant impacts resulting from visual alterations due to projects proposed in the 2030 RTP, the Finding is made that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen some of the significant environmental effects as identified in the final EIR. Further, such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the Finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency. In some visually sensitive areas like the coastal corridor, specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers,
make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR. Visual impacts in some areas would remain significant and unavoidable in the long term.

Cumulative Visual Resources

**Significant Impacts**

Adverse visual quality impacts due to 2030 RTP projects plus other regional projects along new or widened highway corridors would result from the creation of large, manufactured roadway slopes, noise barriers, and the loss of landscaping. Planned or proposed highways that pass through undeveloped areas would result in a significant change in the visual character of the local area. Improvements for rail, such as double-tracking, would result in cumulative visual impacts, especially within the coastal corridor near significant visual features such as lagoons, recreational areas, regional parks, scenic vistas, etc. Even in existing urban settings, rail segments that are elevated would have a high potential for visual impact. Development of the 2030 RTP is considered to have a significant cumulative and unmitigable impact on visual resources, because measures to fully mitigate the impact do not exist and avoidance would mean not completing key elements of the transportation network that would then reduce the effectiveness of the remaining elements.

**Mitigation**

Mitigation measures such as landscaping and contour grading, as described in Vis-1 above and found in Section 4.3.5 of the EIR, would reduce the visual contrast, but the visual changes associated with all regional projects in the area would create a significant and unmitigated cumulative impact to visual quality as the region continues to grow.

**Finding**

For the significant cumulative impacts to visual resources resulting from the 2030 RTP and other regional projects, the Finding is made that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives. The impact to visual resources would remain significant and unavoidable in the long term.

C. Water Resource

Cumulative Water Resources

**Significant Impacts**

Construction projects throughout the region, including those proposed in the 2030 RTP, would result in increased erosion from exposed soil areas, which contributes to sediment-laden runoff into local drainage courses. Erosion can be destructive to the immediate area and sedimentation can clog waterways and downstream wetland and lagoon areas. Though the water quality impacts resulting from the 2030 RTP would be mitigated to below a level of significance, the incremental contributions of all regional projects to increased runoff from impervious surfaces to lagoons and other water bodies, along with pollutants carried by the runoff, would result in a cumulative significant impact, which is not completely mitigable.
Mitigation

Conformance with existing federal, state, and local regulations for grading and the protection of water quality, combined with implementation of best management practices and mitigation measures as discussed in Section 4.9 of the EIR, would lessen this impact; however cumulatively significant impacts would remain. Impact avoidance may be possible by not constructing the cumulative projects near a water course, but this would result in piecemeal development of the RTP thereby making it less effective.

Finding

For the significant cumulative impacts to water resources resulting from the construction and operation of the 2030 RTP and other regional projects, the Finding is made that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures. The cumulative impact to water resources would remain significant and unavoidable.

D. Biological Resources

Coastal Lagoons

Significant Impacts

As proposed in the 2030 RTP, widening of Interstate 5 (I-5) and Coastal Rail double-tracking near coastal lagoons and bluffs from Oceanside to San Diego could result in significant biological impacts. These highly sensitive areas support sensitive habitat and species. Until the specific biological impacts are quantified and feasible mitigation is identified, this impact would remain significant.

Mitigation

Mitigation measures Bio-3, Bio-4, and Bio-5, as listed earlier, would reduce the severity of impacts to coastal lagoons but may not fully mitigate the cumulative impact to coastal resources.

Finding

For the significant impact to coastal lagoons resulting from I-5 widening and Coastal Rail double-tracking, the Finding is made that even with implementation of the appropriate mitigation measures, the impact would not be fully mitigated. Once the potential impact is quantified, specific mitigation may be feasible and could possibly mitigate the impact to below a level of significance. However, until this is accomplished, the impact to coastal lagoons would remain significant and unavoidable. Therefore, specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures. As discussed in Section 4.10 of the EIR, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.
Cumulative Biological Resources

Significant Impacts

Cumulative impacts to native grasslands would remain significant since the habitat is not significantly conserved through programs such as the MSCP. Individual impacts of projects, such as double-tracking across lagoons, could be mitigated; however, there is potential that this impact may not be reduced to below a level of significance. Loss of any riparian (wetland) habitat is considered cumulatively significant and not potentially mitigable. Indirect impacts such as ongoing air, noise, light, and water pollution to sensitive wildlife are considered significant and not fully mitigable.

Mitigation

There are no feasible mitigation measures that would mitigate potential impacts to native grasslands, loss of riparian wetlands including lagoons, or indirect effects to sensitive wildlife to below a level of significance yet continue to allow the RTP to meet its stated mobility goals. These impacts would remain cumulative significant and unmitigable.

Finding

For the significant cumulative impacts to native grasslands, riparian wetlands including lagoons, or indirect effects to sensitive wildlife due to the 2030 RPT and other regional projects, the Finding is made that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures. As discussed in Section 5.1 of the EIR, these cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
CEQA Guidelines require that an EIR must address any significant irreversible environmental changes that would be caused if the proposed project were implemented (CEQA Guidelines §15126.2). An impact would come under this category if: (1) the project would involve a large commitment of nonrenewable resources; (2) the primary and secondary impacts of the project would generally commit future generations to similar uses; (3) the project involves uses in which irreversible damage could result from any potential environmental incidents associated with the project; and (4) the proposed consumption of resources is not justified.

Implementation of the 2030 RTP would result in permanent changes to the existing environment, which have been recognized in other sections of the EIR. The conversion of undeveloped and agricultural land to urbanized uses through construction of new facilities on undeveloped land and the surrounding land is considered a permanent, irreversible change. Biological habitat fragmentation could occur with the construction of linear transportation facilities including both highway and fixed-rail alignments. These changes would be irreversible. The 2030 RTP is based on smart growth land use policies that focus future growth near existing urban areas and could change community character and create a demand for the development of new infrastructure, services, schools, parks, and other community facilities in the affected areas. Implementation of projects proposed in the 2030 RTP would involve the consumption of energy derived from nonrenewable sources, such as fossil and nuclear fuels. Building materials could be considered permanently consumed, although these might be partially recyclable at some future date.
SECTION V
FINDINGS REGARDING GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

CEQA guidelines (§15126.2(d)) require a discussion of growth-inducing impacts of the proposed Project. A project may be considered growth inducing when it:

- Fosters economic growth, population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment;
- Removes obstacles to population growth or additional housing;
- Burdens existing community service facilities beyond current/projected capacities; or
- Encourages or facilitates other activities that could significantly affect the environment.

Growth is generally dependent on the availability of existing utilities and public services in an area. The provision of new utilities and services in an undeveloped area can induce growth in that area. Such growth may or may not be anticipated in local land use planning documents. If a project stimulates development of urban uses, it would have a significant growth-inducing effect. Growth inducement can also occur if the proposed Project makes it more feasible to increase the density of development in surrounding areas. Growth may be considered beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment, depending on its actual impacts to the environmental resources present and the secondary effects growth may have on the resources.

Overall, the 2030 RTP is designed to serve the planned growth for the region through a smart growth land use scenario. Based on the discussion above, some of the land use policies and new transportation facilities recommended in the 2030 RTP could be defined as growth inducing by increasing development density. Smart growth policies encourage higher-density residential uses, employment centers, and mixed-use development adjacent to transit centers and transit corridors. Growth inducement through smart growth policies could be considered beneficial because it reduces potential sprawl and development of existing open areas. More intense growth could create land use impacts if the new higher-intensity development is not designed to be compatible with surrounding existing development if public facilities and infrastructure are not built to meet increased demand.

Growth-inducing impacts would also result from the provision of roadways in areas where access did not previously exist. Certain projects proposed in the 2030 RTP, such as State Route (SR) 11, would create a new roadway in an area that was not previously accessible, thus removing impediments to development. However, the 2030 RTP does not include other facilities or infrastructure such as sewer or water lines that would be necessary for future development.

The 2030 RTP focuses on transportation policies given an assumed level of growth that will occur with or without implementation of its policies and actions. These policies work towards reducing the impact of growth on the region and providing beneficial improvements to regional transportation geared towards smart growth development patterns.
SECTION VI

FINDINGS REGARDING ALTERNATIVES

The SANDAG Board of Directors hereby declares that it has considered and rejected as infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR and described below. CEQA requires that an EIR evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to a project, or to the location of the Project, that (1) offers substantial environmental advantages over the Project proposal, and (2) may be feasibly accomplished in such a manner in which a reasonable period of time considered the economic, environmental, social, and technological factors involved. An EIR must only evaluate reasonable alternatives to a project that could feasibly attain most of the project objectives and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives (CEQA Guidelines §15126.6(a)). In all cases, the consideration of alternatives is to be judged against a rule of reason. The lead agency is not required to choose the environmentally superior alternative identified in the EIR if the alternative does not provide substantial advantages over the proposed Project; and (1) through the imposition of mitigation measures the environmental effects of a project can be reduced to an acceptable level, or (2) there are social, economic, technological, or other considerations that make the alternative infeasible.

The purpose of the proposed 2030 RTP is to provide plan-level improvements for such transportation elements as new and widened freeways, new transit features, expanded HOV opportunities, and regional bikeway corridors while reflecting the existing trends for the San Diego region in terms of modified land use patterns and a greatly improved transit system through the year 2030. At the core of the 2030 RTP are seven broad policy goals, including mobility, accessibility, reliability, efficiency, livability, sustainability, and equity. The most important goal is to improve mobility by better moving people and goods and thereby reducing congestion.

The EIR considered the following five alternatives to the proposed 2030 RTP: (1) No Project, (2) Transit Emphasis Alternative, (3) Highway Emphasis Alternative (Smart Growth), (4) Highway Emphasis Alternative (Current Plans), and (5) Revenue Constrained Alternative. These five alternatives are described in more detail below and can be found in Chapter 7.0 of the EIR.

No Project Alternative

Description

The No Project Alternative, as required by CEQA, addresses the potential effects of developing only the baseline network of transportation projects (highway, transit, local roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian) that are considered committed projects. These projects are identified in the Fiscal Year 2002 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) or have otherwise committed funding. The EIR provides a table that defines the key transit and highway improvements that would occur under this alternative. The baseline network would involve some improvements but there would be fewer new roads and those that would be widened would have fewer lanes than under other alternatives. Additionally, the No Project Alternative assumes a future land use scenario consistent with the smart growth plans that are currently in the process of being completed for large areas of the region. By 2030, the No Project Alternative would involve construction of approximately 230 freeway lane miles, 40 lane miles for carpools, and over 600 lane miles of arterials. The number of transit revenue miles would decrease from the existing condition.
Finding

The No Project Alternative would not meet the goal of mobility because it would result in the worst future congestion of all the five alternatives. This alternative does not work to improve equity or increase accessibility to public transit. In addition, the No Project Alternative may result in inconsistencies with smart growth planning efforts due to lesser transit options. SANDAG finds that the No Project Alternative is infeasible because it does not meet the project goals and objectives of the 2030 RTP.

Transit Emphasis Alternative

Description

Under the Transit Emphasis Alternative, funds would be spent primarily on transit capital expenses, a large part on transit operating expenses, and the remainder on transit projects in the highway system (e.g., managed lanes). Extensive transit systems would cover the central urban core, link the major freeways, and extend eastward on I-8 and SR 67. This system would be based in part on trolley and fixed-rail improvements, but would rely heavily on expansion and improvement of the mobile bus system. Transit revenue miles would be over 280,000 greater than under existing conditions and about 90,000 greater than the next highest network. The emphasis on transit could reduce the need for parking at key attractions (e.g., shopping malls) if people were to shift away from single-occupancy vehicles. The total number of freeway lane miles would increase from existing conditions by approximately 467 lane miles, which would be greater than the No Project scenario, but less than the project. Two freeway connectors would be completed; widening SR 78 north to the east and construction of SR 56 east to I-5 northbound. Carpool lanes would increase substantially as compared to either the existing situation or No Project Alternative. The future land use pattern is based on implementing smart growth policies.

Finding

The Transit Emphasis Alternative would likely have incrementally fewer impacts to land-based resources, such as biology and geology, and is considered the environmentally superior alternative because it would have comparatively less new construction than the other alternatives. However, because more of the focus would be placed on improving transit systems on existing roads instead of building or expanding roads to accommodate cars, carpools, buses, and trucks, this alternative would not fully meet the mobility objectives. SANDAG finds that the Transit Emphasis Alternative would be infeasible because it would not fully accomplish the mobility goals and objectives of the 2030 RTP.

Highway Emphasis Alternative (Smart Growth)

Description

The Highway Emphasis Alternative would focus funds on construction of highways, while maintaining transit-dedicated funds consistent with state and federal directives. Transit would be focused on key corridors north-south (I-5, I-15) and east-west (I-8, SR 78). The Sorrento Mesa Transit way would not be constructed nor would there be double-tracking of the Oceanside-Escondido rail. Other grade-separations would also not be completed. The total number of freeway lane miles would increase by over 1,100 from existing conditions, which would be approximately 300 lane
miles greater than the next closest nonhighway alternative. The number of carpool lane miles would be only 15 greater than under the No Project Alternative. Under this scenario, the land use pattern would reflect smart growth consistent with the 2030 RTP.

Finding

The Highway Emphasis Alternative (Smart Growth), along with the Highway Emphasis Alternative (Current Plans), would result in the greatest environmental impacts of the proposed alternatives. Therefore, this alternative would result in a larger number of significant unmitigable impacts compared to the other alternatives and the proposed project. It would also not achieve as much increased access to public transit. SANDAG finds that the Highway Emphasis Alternative would be infeasible because it would not fully accomplish the mobility goals and objectives of the 2030 RTP.

Highway Emphasis Alternative (Current Plans)

Description

Under this alternative, the transportation network would be almost identical to the Highway Emphasis Alternative (Smart Growth), but the land use pattern would be different. The land use pattern difference would result in variations in performance measurements, particularly regarding proximity to transit opportunities and employment/school, because the future growth would spread over a larger area and would be less focused on mixing residential/employment/educational uses. The transportation network would be the same as in the Highway Emphasis Alternative (Smart Growth); only the underlying land use pattern would change. This alternative is included to provide a quantifiable comparison to the same network overlaid on different land use patterns (smart growth and current plans). Similarly, the other alternatives provide the opportunity to compare network variations with a constant land use assumption (smart growth).

Finding

Because of all the new construction that would occur under this alternative, the Highway Emphasis Alternative (Current Plans) would result in the most environmental impacts of all the proposed alternatives, followed closely by the Highway Emphasis Alternative (Smart Growth). This alternative would result in a large number of significant unmitigable impacts compared to the other alternatives and the proposed project. SANDAG finds that the Highway Emphasis Alternative (Current Plans) would be infeasible because it would not fully accomplish the mobility goals and objectives of the 2030 RTP.

Revenue Constrained Alternative

Description

The Revenue Constrained Alternative derives a transportation network given only known funding sources and assumes flexible funding sources such as TransNet would not be available. Given the reduced funds, fewer capital projects would be completed by 2030. The total freeway lane miles would increase by 583 miles from current conditions, but only about 313 miles more than with the No Project Alternative. This alternative would have a greater emphasis on carpool opportunities than the Highway Emphasis Alternative, but less emphasis on transit than the Transit Emphasis Alternative. The land use pattern for this alternative is assumed to be smart growth.
Finding

The Revenue Constrained Alternative would focus on improving highway travel and would not emphasize transit opportunities. Because transit improvements would be minimal, this alternative would not completely satisfy goals to improve mobility. Therefore, SANDAG finds that the Revenue Constrained Alternative would not fully meet the mobility goals and objectives of the 2030 RTP.
ATTACHMENT 1.B

STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE PROPOSED EXTENSION OF THE TransNet TAX THROUGH 2048

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) Board of Directors adopts and makes this statement of overriding considerations concerning the unavoidable significant impacts of the adoption of Ordinance __, entitled San Diego County Transportation Improvement Program Ordinance and Expenditure Plan, to explain why the Project's benefits override and outweigh its unavoidable impacts.

SANDAG hereby declares that the Final Environmental Impact Report for the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan, State Clearinghouse No. 2002071059 (the “Program EIR”) has identified and discussed all presently foreseeable significant environmental effects that may occur as a result of the proposed Ordinance. The primary purpose of the Ordinance is to extended the TransNet tax, first adopted in 1987 for 40 additional years, from 2008 to 2048, and to adopt a Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program (“RTCIP”) which will provide an additional source of funding, based on construction of new housing units, for transportation system improvements and transportation-related programs proposed in the approved 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (“2030 RTP”). The Ordinance contains an Expenditure Plan and list of specific regional transportation improvement projects and programs planned in the 2030 RTP which will be funded through the TransNet tax extension.

The TransNet tax extension and RTCIP are also intended to provide a long-term source of funding for transportation system improvements and programs which may be proposed in future amendments to the 2030 RTP or a successor RTP. In addition, the Ordinance also provides that a share of the revenues obtained through the TransNet tax extension shall be allocated to local transportation-related projects and programs undertaken by local government agencies which are consistent with the adopted RTP, but which are not necessarily expressly planned or proposed in the 2030 RTP. At the present time the nature, location and/or actual plans for all such future projects or programs is unknown to SANDAG, and the potential significant environmental effects, if any, of such projects cannot be determined. However, to the extent that any such projects have the potential to result in any actual significant environmental effects, full CEQA review of the proposed project or program and the adoption of feasible mitigation measures or alternatives to the proposed project or program will be required before any funds made available under the Ordinance may be utilized for construction or implementation of the project or program.

The Ordinance also provides that a share of the revenues obtained through the TransNet tax extension shall be allocated to local transportation-related projects and programs undertaken by local government agencies which are consistent with the adopted RTP, to unavoidable administrative costs, and to fund environmental mitigation and improvement programs undertaken in connection with certain major regional transportation improvement projects. None of these activities will have significant adverse impacts on the environment.

Since all presently known or reasonably foreseeable significant environmental effects of the Ordinance will result from construction of transportation system improvements or implementation of programs planned in the 2030 RTP, all presently known or foreseeable significant environmental effects of the Ordinance have been analyzed in the Program EIR. With implementation of the
mitigation measures discussed in the Program EIR, all of these presently known or foreseeable significant environmental effects of adoption of the Ordinance can be mitigated to a level of less than significant except for irreversible significant impacts as discussed in Section IV of these Findings (Attachment 1.A). Significant unavoidable and unmitigable impacts would occur to visual and biological resources, and there would be cumulatively significant impacts to land use, visual resources, water resources, and biological resources.

SANDAG hereby declares that it has made a reasonable and good faith effort to eliminate or substantially mitigate the potential impacts resulting from implementation of the 2030 RTP and the regional transportation improvement projects included therein. It is further understood that additional consideration of project-specific mitigation measures and alternatives will be considered for each improvement project or program included in the 2030 RTP which may be funded through the TransNet tax extension or the RTCIP prior to implementation of each project, and that project specific mitigation measures and/or alternatives will be included in the project to the maximum extent feasible in order to further reduce or eliminate potential significant environmental effects of each project.

SANDAG hereby declares that to the extent any mitigation measures recommended in the Program EIR have not and could not be incorporated, such mitigation measures are infeasible because they would impose restrictions on the 2030 RTP that would prohibit the realization of specific legal, economic, social, and other benefits that SANDAG finds outweighs the unmitigated impacts. SANDAG further finds that except for the approved RTP, all other alternatives set forth in the EIR are infeasible because they would prohibit the realization of Project objectives and/or of specific legal, economic, social, and other benefits that SANDAG finds outweigh any environmental benefits of the alternatives.

SANDAG hereby declares that, having reduced the adverse significant environmental effects of the 2030 RTP to the extent feasible by adopting the proposed mitigation measures, having considered the entire administrative record on the 2030 RTP and the proposed Ordinance, and having weighed the benefits of the proposed TransNet extension against its unavoidable adverse impacts after mitigation, SANDAG has determined that the following legal, economic, social, and environmental benefits of the Project outweigh the potential unavoidable adverse impacts and render those potential adverse environmental impacts acceptable based upon the following considerations:

Project Benefits

At the core of the 2030 RTP are seven broad policy goals that address the Project’s long-term mobility needs to better connect transportation and land use policy decisions and to create a transportation network that would serve the region through the year 2030. The 2030 RTP achieves these goals in the following manner:

1. The 2030 RTP achieves increased mobility by improving the movement of people and goods. Average travel times are one minute longer than current conditions, even with one million more people and a half-million more jobs in 2030. The average automobile travel speed for work trips during peak periods would be 28.3 miles per hour (mph) under the 2030 RTP network. Commuters using the extensive Managed/HOV lane system will benefit from the higher average speeds.
2. Average travel speed also would be improved for transit travel under the 2030 RTP. Transit work trips are 4 miles per hour faster than current conditions with an average speed of 13.8 mph.

3. The 2030 RTP improves the reliability of the transportation system by reducing congestion of the freeway network. The 2030 RTP would reduce the percentage of daily vehicle miles traveled at Level of Service (LOS) E (or worse) from 20 percent under current conditions to 17 percent.

4. The 2030 RTP also would benefit freeway congestion during peak periods. The 2030 RTP’s peak-period vehicle miles traveled at LOS E (or worse) would be 25 percent, which is 4 percent less compared to current conditions. This would improve accessibility to major employment and other regional activity centers.

5. The 2030 RTP would reduce the peak-period travel by single-occupant vehicles and encourage the use of alternative transportation modes. The proposed project provides support for alternative modes of transportation. The 2030 RTP would result in 63 percent of homes within 0.5 miles of a transit stop. The significant expansion of regional transit services would increase the transit ridership; daily transit passenger miles (5.2 million) are three times higher compared to current conditions. In addition, 45 percent of jobs will be located within 0.25 miles of a transit stop.

6. The 2030 RTP would result in a higher work trip mode split during peak periods among carpool, transit, and bike/walk trips (measures of Livability). Under Mobility 2030, 27 percent of peak period work trips would be non-drive-alone trips, whereas currently, only 22 percent are non-drive-alone trips. The mode split for transit in the 2030 RTP is 11 percent.

7. The 2030 RTP would better improve access to employment, shopping, and services in all parts of the region. The proposed project would bring home, work, and services together and help eliminate the need for long commuter trips. This is consistent with SANDAG’s regional growth management strategy effort, REGION 2020 and concepts being develop for the Regional Comprehensive Plan, and with the 2030 Preliminary Cities/County Forecast as well as the movement of local jurisdictions to a smart growth land use pattern.

8. The 2030 RTP would provide a well-balanced mix of freeway and arterial improvements to reduce regional and local congestion and transit improvements to increase ridership and provide enhanced public transportation opportunities.

9. Air quality emissions in 2030 are dramatically reduced compared to current conditions, reflecting improvement in fuels and emissions technologies over time. Smog forming pollutants would be reduced from 244 tons per day for current conditions to 43.4 tons per day under the 2030 RTP.

10. The extension of the TransNet tax through the year 2048 is necessary to realize a substantial share of the funding necessary to implement the 2030 RTP and achieve the foregoing benefits to the San Diego County regional transportation system and its users.

11. The extension of the TransNet tax through the year 2048 will also provide a funding mechanism for possible future regional transportation improvement projects which are found necessary to maintain or improve regional transportation service levels after the current expiration
date of the 2030 RTP. The availability of such funding will enable SANDAG and other local and regional planning agencies in San Diego County to continue to plan and implement projects needed to maintain adequate transportation services, reduce future traffic congestion, and achieve resulting benefits for air quality and quality of life of San Diego County citizens.

12. The adoption of the Ordinance will also allow SANDAG greater flexibility in allocating revenues from the TransNet tax to projects benefiting the overall development of safe, efficient, and adequate transportation systems in San Diego County by providing for the allocation of TransNet funds to local improvement projects which are consistent with and augment the Regional Transportation Plan.

13. The Ordinance will also allow limited amounts of the revenue derived from the TransNet tax extension and RTCIP to be utilized to pay essential administrative costs, conduct necessary planning and feasibility studies, and fund environmental mitigation and improvement programs undertaken in connection with major regional transportation improvements planned in the 2030 RTP.

14. The adoption of the RTCIP will provide an additional stable source of funding for regional transportation improvements and programs planned in the 2030 RTP while allocating these costs fairly among local jurisdictions based on population growth, as reflected by new housing construction. The RTCIP also exempts residential construction for low- and very low-income families, thus avoiding any adverse impacts on regional housing supply or any disincentives for construction of affordable new housing for these income groups.

The SANDAG Board of Directors hereby declares that the foregoing benefits provided to the public through adoption of the Ordinance outweigh the identified foreseeable significant adverse environmental impacts of adoption of the Ordinance that cannot be mitigated. SANDAG further finds that each of the described benefits individually outweighs the identified unavoidable adverse environmental effects of the adoption of the Ordinance, and therefore finds those impacts acceptable.
ATTACHMENT 1.C

FINDING ADOPTING A MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE PROPOSED EXTENSION OF THE TransNet TAX

A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been prepared and adopted for the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan ("2030 RTP") and approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors in March 2003. The SANDAG Board of Directors finds that the MMRP fully and adequately addresses all environmental impacts and mitigation measures which have been adopted in connection with the 2030 RTP and which may occur or be utilized as a result of implementation of individual transportation system improvement projects and programs proposed in the 2030 RTP which may be funded through the extension of the TransNet tax or adoption of the RTCIP as provided by Ordinance __. SANDAG therefore will utilize the MMRP as the mitigation monitoring and reporting program required by Public Resources Code §21081.6 for the proposed extension of the TransNet tax and adoption of the RTCIP. The MMRP will remain available for public review during the compliance period.

Introduction

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that public agencies adopting Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs) take affirmative steps to determine that approved mitigation measures are implemented subsequent to project approval. The lead or responsible agency must adopt a reporting and monitoring program for the mitigation measures incorporated into a project or included as conditions of approval. The program must be designed to ensure compliance with the EIR during project implementation. (Public Resources Code §20181.6, subdivision (a)(1).)

This MMRP will be used by SANDAG, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), transit agencies, and other local jurisdictions to ensure compliance with mitigation measures associated with the adoption of the 2030 RTP. SANDAG is the lead agency under CEQA for the project.

Mitigation is required to address significant or potentially significant environmental impacts to Land Use (open space and resource lands), Social Environment (displacement), Noise, Geology, Paleontology, Water Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, and Visual Resources. In some cases, the residual impacts remain significant even after mitigation measures are incorporated.

No impacts or less than significant impacts would occur to Land Use (patterns and planned land uses), Social Environment, Visual Resources (short-term construction), Traffic (regional system), Energy, Mineral Resources, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Public Services, Utilities and Service Systems, Recreation, Environmental Justice, and Air Quality; therefore, no mitigation is proposed or required.
FINDING REGARDING LOCATION AND CUSTODIAN OF RECORD

The documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings on Ordinance __, entitled San Diego Transportation County Improvement Program Ordinance and Expenditure Plan (herein, “the Ordinance”), upon which SANDAG’s findings are based are located at 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, California 92101. The custodian of these documents is Rob Rundle, Senior Regional Planner. This information is provided in compliance with Public Resources Code §21081.6(a)(2) and 14 California Code of Regulations §15091(e).

For purposes of CEQA at these Findings, the Record of Proceedings for the Project consists of the following documents, at a minimum:

1. The Notice of Preparation and all other public notices issued by SANDAG and in conjunction with the preparation, consideration, and adoption of the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (“2030 RTP”) and consideration and approval of the Ordinance.

2. The Draft and Final EIRs for the 2030 RTP, including appendices and technical studies included or referenced in the Draft and Final EIRs.

3. All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the 45-day public comment period on the Draft EIR for the 2030 RTP.

4. All comments and correspondence submitted to SANDAG with respect to the 2030 RTP and with respect to the proposed adoption of the Ordinance.

5. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the 2030 RTP.

6. All Findings and resolutions adopted by SANDAG decision makers in connection with the 2030 RTP and in connection with the review and adoption of the Ordinance, and all documents cited or referred to therein.

7. All reports, studies, memoranda, maps, staff reports, or other planning documents relating to the 2030 RTP prepared by EDAW, Inc., consultants to SANDAG, including the subconsultants retained by EDAW, Inc.

8. All documents and information submitted to SANDAG by responsible, trustee, or other public agencies, or by individuals or organizations, in connection with the 2030 RTP and/or in connection with the Ordinance, up through the date the SANDAG Board of Directors’ approval of the Ordinance.

9. Minutes and/or verbatim transcripts of all information sessions, public meetings, and public hearings held by SANDAG, in connection with the 2030 RTP and in connection with the Ordinance.

10. Any documentary or other evidence submitted to SANDAG at such information sessions, public meetings, and public hearings.
11. Matters of common knowledge to SANDAG, including but not limited to federal, state, and local laws and regulations.

12. Any documents expressly cited in these Findings, in addition to those cited above.

13. Any other materials required to be in the Record of Proceedings by Public Resources Code §21167.6(e).
Attachment 1

TransNet Extension
ORDINANCE AND EXPENDITURE PLAN
Commission Ordinance 04-01

[Changes to the Draft Ordinance accepted for distribution by the SANDAG Board of Directors on April 9, 2004 shown in line-in - line-out format]

The San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission ordains as follows:

SECTION 1. TITLE: This ordinance shall be known and may be cited as the San Diego Transportation Improvement Program Ordinance and Expenditure Plan (Commission Ordinance 04-01), hereinafter referred to as the Ordinance. This Ordinance provides for an extension of the retail transactions and use tax implemented by the initial San Diego Transportation Improvement Program Ordinance (Commission Ordinance 87-1 - Proposition A, 1987) for a forty year period commencing on April 1, 2008. The Expenditure Plan for this extension is set forth in Sections 2 and 4 herein and is an expansion of the Expenditure Plan contained in Commission Ordinance 87-1.

SECTION 2. EXPENDITURE PLAN SUMMARY: This Ordinance provides for the implementation of the San Diego Transportation Improvement Program, which will result in countywide transportation facility and service improvements for highways, rail transit services, new bus rapid transit services, local bus services, senior and disabled transportation services, local streets and roads, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, transportation-related community infrastructure to support smart growth development, and related environmental mitigation and enhancement projects. These needed improvements shall be funded by the continuation of the one-half of one percent transactions and use tax for a period of forty years. The revenues shall be deposited in a special fund and used solely for the identified improvements. The specific projects and programs to be funded shall be further described in the document titled “TransNet Extension Expenditure Plan Analysis”, which is hereby incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein. Any ancillary proceeds resulting from the implementation of the San Diego Transportation Improvement Program shall be used for transportation improvement projects in the San Diego region. A summary of the major projects and programs, including the major highway and transit improvements depicted on Figure 1, is provided in the following sections. All dollar references in this Ordinance are in 2002 dollars.

A. Congestion Relief Program - Major Transportation Corridor Improvements:

1. Highway and transit capital projects: Of the total funds available, an estimated $5,150 million will be used to match an estimated $4,795 million in federal, state, local and other revenues to complete the projects listed below (see Figure 1). The total costs include an estimated $500 million in financing costs related to bonds to be issued to accelerate the implementation of the major Congestion Relief projects identified in this section. The costs shown include the total estimated implementation costs of each project net of habitat-related environmental mitigation costs for those transportation projects, which are funded under Section 2(D). Three of the highway projects listed below (SR 67, SR 76, and a portion of SR 94) are described as including environmental enhancements, as further described in the document titled “Environmental Enhancement Criteria for Mitigating Highway 67, 76 and 94 Expansion Impacts”, which is hereby incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.
Local street and road projects, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, and other projects not shown.

Figure 1
TRANSNET EXTENSION
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a. **Highway Capital Improvements** (including managed lane/high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane additions and general purpose lane additions) - $6,760 million:

1. Interstate 5 South: Add two HOV lanes from I-8 to SR 905 - $722 million.

2. Interstate 5 Mid-Coast: Add two HOV lanes from I-8 to I-805, including funding for environmental work and preliminary engineering for improvements at the I-5/I-8 interchange - $192 million.

3. Interstate 5 North: Add four managed lanes from I-805 to Vandegrift Boulevard in Oceanside, including HOV to HOV connectors at the I-5/I-805 interchange and freeway connectors at the I-5/SR 56 and I-5/SR 78 interchanges - $1,234 million.

4. Interstate 8: Add two general purpose lanes from Second Street to Los Coches Road - $29 million.

5. Interstate 15: Add four managed lanes from SR 78 to Centre City Parkway in Escondido and from SR 56 to SR 163 and add two HOV lanes from SR 163 to SR 94, including HOV to HOV connectors at the I-15/SR 78 and I-15/SR 94 interchanges - $882 million.

6. Interstate 805: Add four managed lanes from I-5 to SR 54 and two reversible HOV lanes from SR 54 to SR 905, including HOV to HOV connectors at the I-805/SR 52 interchange and improvements at the I-805/SR 54 interchange - $1,371 million.

7. SR 54/SR 125: Add two lanes to provide a continuous facility with three general purpose lanes and one HOV lane in each direction - $139 million.

8. SR 56: Add one general purpose lane in each direction from I-5 to I-15 - $99 million.

9. SR 52: Construct four-lane freeway from SR 125 to SR 67, add two general purpose lanes and two reversible managed lanes from I-15 to SR 125, and add two HOV lanes from I-805 to I-15 - $476 million.

10. SR 67: Expand to a continuous four-lane facility, including environmental enhancements, from Mapleview Street to Dye Road - $218 million.

11. SR 75/SR 282: Provide matching funds for construction purposes only for a tunnel from Glorietta Boulevard to Alameda Boulevard - $25 million.

12. SR 76: Add two general purposes lanes from Melrose Drive to I-15, including environmental enhancements from Mission Road to I-15 - $164 million.

13. SR 78: Add two HOV lanes from I-5 to I-15 - $495 million.

14. SR 94/SR 125: Add two HOV lanes from I-5 to I-8, including freeway connectors at the SR94/SR 125 interchange - $601 million.
15. SR 94: Widen to six lanes from SR 125 to Avocado Boulevard and expand to a continuous four-lane facility from Avocado Boulevard to Steele Canyon Road, including environmental enhancements from Jamacha Road to Steele Canyon Road - $88 million.


b. **Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and Rail Transit Capital Improvements** - $2,685 million:

1. BRT service from Escondido to Downtown San Diego using the I-15/SR 94 managed/HOV facilities, including new and improved stations and direct access ramps - $369 million.

2. BRT service from Escondido to Sorrento Mesa using the managed lane facility on I-15 - $60 million.

3. BRT service from Otay Mesa to Downtown San Diego using I-805/SR 94 managed/HOV lane facilities, including new stations and direct access ramps - $497 million.

4. BRT service from San Ysidro to Sorrento Mesa using the managed/HOV lane facilities on I-805/I-15/SR 52 including station improvements - $70 million.

5. Blue Line Light Rail Transit improvements including station enhancements, signal upgrades, conversion to low-floor vehicles and grade separations in Chula Vista - $268 million.

6. Mid-Coast Transit Guideway Improvement Project using light rail technology to provide high-level transit service along the I-5 corridor from the Old Town area to the U.C. San Diego/University Towne Center area, would rely in part on federal funding. Absent federal funding, then bus technology may be considered for the high level service planned for this corridor - $660 million.

7. Super Loop providing high quality connections to locations in the greater U. C. San Diego/University Towne Center area, including arterial improvements with bus priority treatments, stations and vehicles - $30 million.

8. North I-5 Corridor Coaster/BRT service providing high quality north-south transit service improvements by upgrading the Coaster commuter rail tracks and stations, providing BRT service in the El Camino Real corridor, or a combination of the two - $376 million.

9. Orange Line Light Rail Transit Improvements including station enhancements, signal upgrades and conversion to low-floor vehicles - $69 million.
10. **SR 78 Corridor Sprinter/BRT service** providing high-quality east-west transit service improvements by upgrading and extending the Sprinter rail line, providing BRT service along the Palomar Airport Road corridor, or a combination of the two - $197 million.

11. **BRT service from San Diego State University to Downtown San Diego** along the El Cajon Boulevard/Park Boulevard corridor with arterial improvements with bus priority treatments, stations and vehicles - $89 million.

2. **Operating Support for the BRT and Rail Transit Capital Improvements**: Of the total funds available, an estimated $1,100 million will be used to operate and maintain the services described under Section 2(A)(1)(b).

3. **Environmental Mitigation**: An estimated $600 million, including $450 million for direct mitigation costs and $150 million for economic benefit, will be used to fund the habitat-related mitigation costs of the major highway and transit projects identified in the Regional Transportation Plan as part of the Environmental Mitigation Program described in Section 2(D).

B. **Congestion Relief Program - Transit System Service Improvements and Related Programs**:

An estimated $2,240 million will be used to provide ongoing support for the reduced-price monthly transit programs for seniors, persons with disabilities, and students and for the continuation and expansion of rail, express bus, local bus, community shuttles, and dial-a-ride services, including specialized services for seniors and persons with disabilities, and related capital improvements.

C. **Congestion Relief Program - Local System Improvements and Related Programs**:

An estimated total of $4,480 million will be allocated to local programs in the following three categories:

1. **Local Street and Road Program**: An estimated $3,950 million will be allocated on a fair and equitable basis, using the formula specified in Section 4(D)(1), to each city and the County of San Diego (hereinafter referred to as local agencies) to supplement other revenues available for local street and road improvements. In developing the biennial list of projects to be funded with these revenues as required under Section 5(A), local agencies shall give high priority in the use of these funds to improvements to regional arterials, grade separation projects, and related facilities contributing to congestion relief. It is the intent that at least 70% of the revenues provided for local street and road purposes should be used to fund direct expenditures for construction of new or expanded facilities, major rehabilitation and reconstruction of roadways, traffic signal coordination and related traffic operations improvements, transportation-related community infrastructure improvements to support smart growth development, capital improvements needed to facilitate transit services and facilities, and operating support for local shuttle and circulator routes and other services. No more than 30% of these funds should be used for local street and road maintenance purposes. A local agency desiring to spend more than 30% of its annual revenues on local street and road maintenance-related projects shall provide justification to the Commission as part of its biennial project list submittal. The Commission shall review each local agency’s biennial project list submittal and make a finding of consistency with the provisions of this
Ordinance and with the Regional Transportation Plan prior to approving the local agency’s project list for funding. The Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee shall also review the proposed project lists and make recommendations to the Commission.

2. Environmental Mitigation: An estimated $250 million, including $200 million for direct mitigation costs and $50 million for economic benefit, will be used to fund the habitat-related mitigation costs of local transportation projects consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan as part of the Environmental Mitigation Program described in Section 2(D).

3. Smart Growth Incentive Program: An estimated $280 million will be allocated to the Smart Growth Incentive Program to provide funding for a broad array of transportation-related infrastructure improvements that will assist local agencies in better integrating transportation and land use, such as enhancements to streets and public places, funding of infrastructure needed to support development in smart growth opportunity areas consistent with the Regional Comprehensive Plan, and community planning efforts related to smart growth and improved land use/transportation coordination. These funds shall be allocated on a regional competitive grant basis. It is intended that these funds be used to match federal, state, local, and private funding to maximize the number of improvements to be implemented. The Commission shall establish specific project eligibility criteria for this program.

D. Transportation Project Environmental Mitigation:

An estimated $850 million will be used to fund habitat-related environmental mitigation activities required in the implementation of the major highway, transit and regional arterial and local street and road improvements identified in the Regional Transportation Plan. Of this total, an estimated $250 million is related to mitigation requirements for local transportation projects and an estimated $600 million is related to mitigation requirements for the major highway and transit projects identified in the Regional Transportation Plan. The intent is to establish a program to provide for large-scale acquisition and management of critical habitat areas and to create a reliable approach for funding required mitigation for future transportation improvements thereby reducing future costs and accelerating project delivery. This approach would be implemented by obtaining coverage for transportation projects through existing and proposed multiple species conservation plans. If this approach cannot be fully implemented, then these funds shall be used for environmental mitigation purposes on a project by project basis. Additional detail regarding this program is described in the document titled “TransNet Extension Environmental Mitigation Program Principles”, which is hereby incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.

E. Bicycle, Pedestrian and Neighborhood Safety Program:

A total of two percent of the total annual revenues available (an estimated $280 million) will be allocated to the Bicycle, Pedestrian and Neighborhood Safety Program to provide funding for bikeway facilities and connectivity improvements, pedestrian and walkable community projects, bicycle and pedestrian safety projects and programs, and traffic calming projects. These funds shall be allocated on a regional competitive grant basis. It is intended that these funds be used to match federal, state, local, and private funding to maximize the number of improvements to be implemented. The Commission shall establish specific project eligibility criteria for this program.
F. Administration and Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee:

Up to one percent of the total annual revenues available will be used for administrative expenses and up to $250,000 per year will be used for the operation of an Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee.

SECTION 3. IMPOSITION OF TRANSACTIONS AND USE TAX: In addition to any other taxes authorized by law, there is hereby imposed in the incorporated and unincorporated territory of the County of San Diego, in accordance with the provisions of Part 1.6 (commencing with Section 7251) of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code and Division 12.7 of the Public Utilities Code commencing with Code Section 132000, an extension of the existing transactions and use tax at the rate of one-half of one percent (1/2%) commencing April 1, 2008, for a period of forty years, in addition to any existing or future authorized state or local transactions and use tax. If, during this time period, additional state or federal funds become available which would fund the projects and services contained in the Regional Transportation Plan, then the tax may be reduced by action of the Commission.

SECTION 4. EXPENDITURE PLAN PURPOSES: The revenues received by the Commission from the existing measure as extended by this measure, after deduction of required Board of Equalization costs for performing the functions specified in Section 132304(b) of the Public Utilities Code, shall be used to improve transportation facilities and services countywide as set forth in the expanded Expenditure Plan and in a manner consistent with the long-range Regional Transportation Plan and the short-range, multi-year Regional Transportation Improvement Program, and for the administration of the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission Act (hereinafter referred to as the "Act") commencing with Public Utilities Code Section 132000. Commencing July 1, 2008, after the deduction of administrative expenses, Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee expenses, and funding for the Bicycle, Pedestrian and Neighborhood Safety Program as described in Sections 2(E), 2(F), 11 and 12, the remaining annual revenues shall be allocated as follows:

A. Forty-two and four-tenths percent for the major highway and transit Congestion Relief projects specified in Section 2(A)(1), including four and four-tenths percent for the habitat-related mitigation costs of the major highway and transit projects as described in Section 2(A)(3) to be used to fund a portion of the Environmental Mitigation Program described in Section 2(D).

B. Eight and one-tenth percent for operation of the specific transit Congestion Relief projects as described in Section 2(A)(2). This funding is for the operation of new or expanded services only and is not available for the operation of services in existence prior to the effective date of this Ordinance.

C. Sixteen and one-half percent for the transit programs described in Section 2(B). The revenues made available annually for transit purposes shall be allocated and expended pursuant to the following distribution formula and priorities:

1. Two and one-half percent of the funds made available under Section 4(C) shall be used to support improved transportation services for seniors and disabled persons. These funds shall be used to support specialized paratransit services required by the federal Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

2. Three and one-fourth percent of the funds made available under Section 4(C) shall be used to support a competitive grant program for nonprofit organizations and local
agencies. The funds shall be used to provide specialized transportation services for seniors focusing on innovative and cost-effective approaches to providing improved senior transportation, including, but not limited to, shared group services, special shuttle services using volunteer forces, and brokerage of multi-jurisdictional transportation services.

3. From the remaining revenues, there shall be expended such sums as necessary to guarantee in the North San Diego County Transit Development Board and Metropolitan Transit Development Board areas of jurisdiction for the duration of the measure (1) a monthly regional transit pass for senior (60 years or older) and disabled riders priced at not more than 25 percent of the cost of the regular regional monthly transit pass, and (2) a monthly regional youth transit pass for students (18 years or under) priced at not more than 50 percent of the cost of the regular regional monthly transit pass.

4. Remaining revenues shall be allocated for transit service improvements, including operations and supporting capital improvements. The revenues shall be allocated through the annual transit operator budget process and the improvements to be funded shall be consistent with the Short Range Transit Plan.

5. To maintain eligibility for the receipt of funds under Section 4(C), a transit operator must limit the increase in its total operating cost per revenue vehicle hour for bus services or the increase in its total operating cost per revenue vehicle mile for rail services from one fiscal year to the next to no more than the increase in the Consumer Price Index for San Diego County over the same period. If the requirement is not achieved, the operator may not receive any additional funding under Section 4(C) in the following year above the amount received in the previous fiscal year adjusted for any increase in the Consumer Price Index for San Diego County. If there were unusual circumstances in a given fiscal year, the operator may request the approval of the Commission to calculate the requirement as an average over the previous three fiscal years. The operator may also request the approval of the Commission to exclude from the calculation certain cost increases that were due to external events entirely beyond the operator’s control, including, but not limited to, increases in the costs for fuel, insurance premiums, or new state or federal mandates.

D. Thirty-three percent for the Local Programs described in Section 2(C) in the following three categories:

1. Twenty-nine and one-tenth percent for the local street and road program described in Section 2(C)(1). The revenues available for the local street and road program shall be allocated and expended pursuant to the following distribution formula:

   a. Each local agency shall receive an annual base sum of $50,000.

   b. The remaining revenues after the base sum distribution shall be distributed to the each local agency on the following basis:

      1. Two-thirds based on total population using the most recent Department of Finance population estimates.

      2. One-third based on maintained street and road mileage.
c. For the purposes of Section 4D(1)(a) and (b), any new incorporations or annexations which take place after July 1 of any fiscal year shall be incorporated into the formula beginning with the subsequent fiscal year. The San Diego Association of Governments population estimates of such new incorporations or annexations shall be used until such time as Department of Finance population estimates are available.

2. One and eight-tenths percent for the habitat-related mitigation costs of local transportation projects described in Section 2(C)(2) to be used to fund a portion of the Environmental Mitigation Program described in Section 2(D).

3. Two and one-tenth percent for the Smart Growth Incentive Program described in Section 2(C)(3).

E. General Provisions:

1. In implementing the projects funded under Section 4(A), priority shall be given to projects included in the Expenditure Plan for Proposition A as passed by the voters in 1987 that remain uncompleted, such as the eastern ends of the SR 52 and SR 76 highway improvement projects and the Mid-Coast light rail transit project. The Commission shall ensure that sufficient funding or bonding capacity remain available to implement such projects as expeditiously as possible once the environmental clearance for these projects is obtained and needed state and federal matching funds are committed.

2. Once any state highway facility or usable portion thereof is constructed to at least minimum acceptable state standards, the state shall be responsible for the maintenance and operation thereof.

3. All new projects, or major reconstruction projects, funded by revenues provided under this Ordinance shall accommodate travel by pedestrians and bicyclists, except where pedestrians and bicyclists are prohibited by law from using a given facility or where the costs of including bikeways and walkways would be excessively disproportionate to the need or probable use. Such facilities for pedestrian and bicycle use shall be designed to the best currently available standards and guidelines.

4. All state highway improvements to be funded with revenues as provided in this measure, including project development and overall project management, shall be a joint responsibility of Caltrans and the Commission. All major project approval actions including the project concept, the project location, and any subsequent change in project scope shall be jointly agreed upon by Caltrans and the Commission and, where appropriate, by the Federal Highway Administration and/or the California Transportation Commission.

SECTION 5. EXPENDITURE PLAN PROCEDURES:

A. Each local agency shall biennially develop a five-year list of projects to be funded with revenues made available for local street and road improvements under Section 4(D). A local public hearing on the proposed list of projects shall be held by each local agency prior to submitting its project list to the Commission for approval pursuant to Section 6.
B. All projects to be funded with revenues made available under Section 4 must be consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Project priorities or phasing shall also be consistent with the RTP. The Expenditure Plan shall be reviewed for consistency with RTP following each major update of the RTP as required by state or federal law. The Expenditure Plan shall be amended as necessary to maintain consistency with the Regional Transportation Plan. If funds become available in excess of the amount allocated in the Expenditure Plan, additional projects shall be added to the Expenditure Plan consistent with the priorities in the Regional Transportation Plan. Any amendments to the Expenditure Plan shall be made in accordance with the procedures for amending this ordinance as provided for in Section 16.

C. In the allocation of all revenues made available under Section 4, the Commission shall make every effort to maximize state and federal transportation funding to the region. The Commission may amend the Expenditure Plan, in accordance with Section 16, as needed to maximize the transportation funding to the San Diego region.

SECTION 6. PROJECT PROGRAMMING APPROVAL: The Commission shall biennially approve a five-year project list and a biennial program of projects to be funded during the succeeding two fiscal years with the revenues made available under Section 4 herein. The program of projects will be prepared as a part of the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) process as required by state and federal law. A public hearing will be held prior to approval of the program of projects. The Commission may amend the program of projects as necessary in accordance with the RTIP amendment procedures. Projects shall not be funded with the revenues made available under Section 4 unless the projects are in the approved program of projects.

SECTION 7. COOPERATIVE FUND AGREEMENTS: Except as provided for herein, the distribution of funds as set forth in Section 4 shall be met over the duration of the measure. To maximize the effective use of funds, revenues may be transferred or exchanged under the following circumstances:

A. The Commission, or agencies receiving funds by annual or multi-year agreement, may exchange or loan funds provided that the percentage of funds allocated for each purpose as provided in Section 4 is maintained over the duration of the measure and reviewed as part each 10-year comprehensive program review as described in Section 17. All proposed exchanges, including agreements between agencies to exchange or loan funds, must include detailed fund repayment provisions, including appropriate interest earnings such that the Commission suffers no loss of funds as a result of the exchange or loan. All exchanges must be approved by the Commission and shall be consistent with any and all rules approved by the Commission relating thereto.

B. The Commission may exchange revenues for federal, state, or other local funds allocated or granted to any public agency within or outside the area of jurisdiction of the Commission to maximize effectiveness in the use of revenues. Such federal, state, or local funds shall be distributed in the same manner as the revenues from the measure.

SECTION 8. MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT: It is the intent of the Legislature, as stated in the Act, and the Commission that revenues provided from this measure be used to augment, not supplant existing local revenues being used for the purposes set forth in Section 4 herein. Each local agency receiving revenues pursuant to Section 4(D) shall annually maintain as a minimum the same level of local discretionary funds expended for street and road purposes on average over the last three fiscal years completed prior to the operative date of this Ordinance (Fiscal Years 2000-01, 2001-02,
2002-03), as was reported in the State Controller's Annual Report of Financial Transactions for Streets and Roads and as verified by an independent auditor. The maintenance of effort level as determined through this process shall be subject to adjustment every three years based on the Construction Cost Index developed by Caltrans. Any increase in the maintenance of effort level based on this adjustment shall not exceed the growth rate in the local jurisdiction's General Fund revenues over the same time period. The Commission shall not allocate any revenues pursuant to Section 4(D) to any eligible local agency in any fiscal year until that local agency has certified to the Commission that it will include in its budget for that fiscal year an amount of local discretionary funding for streets and roads purposes at least equal to the minimum maintenance of effort requirement. An annual independent audit shall be conducted to verify that the maintenance of effort requirement for each agency was met. Any local agency which does not meet its maintenance of effort requirement in any given year shall have its funding under Section 4(D)(1) reduced in the following year by the amount by which the agency did not meet its required maintenance of effort level. In the event that special circumstances prevent a local agency from meeting its maintenance of effort requirement, the local agency may request up to three additional fiscal years to fulfill its requirement. Such a request must be approved by the Commission. The Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee shall also review such requests and make recommendations to the Commission. Any local street and road revenues not allocated pursuant to the maintenance of effort requirement shall be redistributed to the remaining eligible agencies according to the formula described in Section 4(D)(1). The maintenance of effort requirement also shall apply to any local agency discretionary funds being used for the other purposes specified under Section 4. In addition, revenues provided from this Ordinance shall not be used to replace other private developer funding that has been or will be committed for any project.

SECTION 9. REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION CONGESTION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (RTCIP):

A. New Development Exactions

Starting on July 1, 2008, each jurisdiction local agency in the San Diego region shall contribute $2,000 in exactions from the private sector, for each newly constructed residential housing unit in that jurisdiction to the RTCIP. These exactions shall ensure future development contributes its proportional share of the funding needed to pay for the Regional Arterial System and related regional transportation facility improvements, as defined in San Diego Association of Governments’ (SANDAG’s) most recent, adopted Regional Transportation Plan. New residential housing units constructed for extremely low, very-low, low, and moderate income households, as defined in California Health and Safety Code Sections 50105, 50106, 50079.5 and 50093, will be exempted from the $2,000 per unit contribution requirement. No other new residential units shall be exempted.

The amount of contribution shall be increased annually, in an amount not to exceed the percentage increase set forth in the Engineering Construction Cost Index published by the Engineering News Record or similar cost of construction index. Each jurisdiction local agency shall establish an impact fee or other-revenue Funding Program by which it collects and funds its contribution to the RTCIP. Each jurisdiction local agency shall be responsible for establishing a procedure for providing its monetary contribution to the RTCIP. The RTCIP revenue will be used to construct improvements on the Regional Arterial System such as new or widened arterials, traffic signal coordination and other traffic improvements, freeway interchange and related freeway improvements, railroad grade separations, and improvements required for regional express bus and rail transit. This action is predicated on the desire to establish a uniform mitigation program that will mitigate the regional transportation impacts of new development on the Arterial system. While the RTCIP cannot and should not fund all necessary regional transportation network components and improvements, the RTCIP will establish a new revenue source that ensures future development will contribute its pro rata share towards addressing the impacts of new growth on regional transportation infrastructure.
B. Oversight, Audit and Funding Allocations

The Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program (RTCIP) shall be overseen by SANDAG and implemented by each jurisdiction's local agency, with the objective of developing a consolidated mitigation program for the San Diego region as a funding source for the Regional Arterial System. The RTCIP and each jurisdiction's local agency's Funding Program shall be subject to an annual review and audit to be carried out by the SANDAG and the Independent Taxpayers Oversight Committee, as defined in Section 11 of this Ordinance. Any jurisdiction's local agency that does not provide its full monetary contribution required by Section 9(A) in a given fiscal year will not be eligible to receive funding for local streets and roads under section 4(D)(1) of the TransNet Ordinance for the immediately following fiscal year. Any funding not allocated under 4(D)(1) as a result of this requirement shall be reallocated to the remaining jurisdictions' local agencies that are in compliance with this Section.

C. Implementation of the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTCIP)

Provisions for implementation of the RTCIP are described in the document titled “TransNet Extension Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program,” which is hereby incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.

SECTION 10. BONDING AUTHORITY: Upon voter approval of the ballot proposition to approve the extension of the tax and the issuance of bonds payable from the proceeds of the tax, bonds may be issued by the Commission pursuant to Division 12.7 of the Public Utilities Code, at any time, and from time to time, payable from the proceeds of the existing tax and its extension and secured by a pledge of revenues from the proceeds of the tax, in order to finance and refinance improvements authorized by Ordinance 87-1 and this Ordinance. The Commission, in allocating the annual revenues from the measure, shall meet all debt service requirements prior to allocating funds for other projects.

SECTION 11. INDEPENDENT TAXPAYER OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE: An Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) shall be established to provide an enhanced level of accountability for expenditure made under the Expenditure Plan. The ITOC will help to ensure that all voter mandates are carried out as required and will develop recommendations for improvements to the financial integrity and performance of the program. The roles and responsibilities of the ITOC, the selection process for ITOC members, and related administrative procedures shall be carried out in substantially the same manner as further described in the document titled “Statement of Understanding Regarding the Implementation of the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee for the TransNet Program,” which is hereby incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein. Up to $250,000 per year, with adjustments for inflation based on the Consumer Price Index for San Diego County, may be expended for activities related to the ITOC.

SECTION 12. ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES: Revenues may be expended by the Commission for staff salaries, wages, benefits, and overhead and for those services, including contractual services, necessary to administer the Act; however, in no case shall such expenditures exceed one percent of the annual revenues provided by the measure. Any funds not utilized in a given fiscal year shall remain available for expenditure in subsequent fiscal years. Costs of performing or contracting for project related work shall be paid from the revenues allocated to the appropriate purpose as set forth in Section 4 herein. An annual independent audit shall be conducted through the Independent Taxpayers Oversight Committee to assure that the revenues expended by the
Commission under this section are necessary and reasonable in carrying out its responsibilities under the Act.

SECTION 13. ESTABLISHMENT OF SEPARATE ACCOUNTS: Each agency receiving funds pursuant to Section 4 shall have its funds deposited in a separate Transportation Improvement Account. Interest earned on funds allocated pursuant to this Ordinance shall be expended only for those purposes for which the funds were allocated.

SECTION 14. IMPLEMENTING ORDINANCES: Upon approval of this measure by the voters, the Commission shall, in addition to the local rules required to be provided pursuant to this ordinance, adopt implementing ordinances, rules, and policies and take such other actions as may be necessary and appropriate to carry out its responsibilities.

SECTION 15. EFFECTIVE AND OPERATIVE DATES: This Ordinance shall be operative effective on November 3, 2004, if one of the following events occurs: 1) two-thirds of the electors voting on the ballot proposition approving the ordinance vote to approve the ballot proposition on November 2, 2004; or 2) a law is passed on or before November 2, 2004 that lowers the voter approval threshold applicable to this Ordinance and the number of electors voting in favor of this Ordinance meets that threshold. The extension of the tax authorized by Section 3 of this Ordinance shall be effective operative on April 1, 2008. Bonds payable from the proceeds of the tax may be issued at any time prior to, on or after April 1, 2008. The provisions of Section 4 of this Ordinance, relating to the allocation of revenues, shall be effective operative on July 1, 2008.

SECTION 16. AMENDMENTS: With the exception of Sections 3, 4(E)(1), 8, 9, and 11 which require a vote of the electors of the County of San Diego to amend, this ordinance may be amended to further its purposes by ordinance, passed by roll call vote entered in the minutes, with two-thirds of the Commission concurring consistent with the Commission’s standard voting mechanism. Separate documents incorporated by reference in the Ordinance in Sections 2, 9, and 11 also may be amended with a two-thirds vote of the Commission.

SECTION 17. TEN-YEAR COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM REVIEW: The Commission shall conduct a comprehensive review of all projects and programs implemented under the Expenditure Plan to evaluate the performance of the overall program over the previous ten years and to make revisions to the Expenditure Plan to improve its performance over the subsequent ten years. Such comprehensive program reviews shall be conducted in Fiscal Years 2019, 2029 and 2039. Revisions to the Ordinance and Expenditure Plan required as a result of the ten-year review shall be subject to the amendment process in Section 16.

SECTION 18. DESIGNATION OF FACILITIES: Each project or program in excess of $250,000 funded in whole or in part by revenues from this measure Ordinance shall be clearly designated during its construction or implementation as being provided by revenues from this measure Ordinance.

SECTION 19. SEVERABILITY: If any section, subsection, part, clause or phrase of this Ordinance is for any reason held unenforceable or unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, that holding shall not affect the validity or enforceability of the remaining funds or provisions of this Ordinance, and the Commission declares that it would have passed each part of this Ordinance irrespective of the validity of any other part. Notwithstanding the foregoing, if any part, clause, or phrase of Section 9(A) of the Ordinance is for any reason held unenforceable or unconstitutional, the remaining portions of Section 9 shall be deemed invalid.
SECTION 20. ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS LIMIT: Article XIII(B) of the California Constitution requires the establishment of an annual appropriations limit for certain governmental entities. The maximum annual appropriations limit for the Commission shall be established as $950 million for the 2004-05 fiscal year. The appropriations limit shall be subject to adjustment as provided by law. All expenditures of the transactions and use tax revenues imposed in Section 3 are subject to the appropriations limit of the Commission.

SECTION 21. DEFINITIONS:

A. Commission. Means the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission created by Chapter 1576 of the Statutes of 1985 (Division 12.7 of the Public Utilities Code, commencing with Section 132000).

B. Transit. Means all purposes necessary and convenient to the construction, operation and maintenance of transit public transportation services and facilities including the acquisition of vehicles and right-of-way. Transit public transportation services include, but are not limited to, local and express bus, bus rapid transit (BRT), paratransit (dial-a-ride), fixed guideway, light rail (trolley) and commuter rail services and facilities.

C. Local Streets and Roads. Means all purposes necessary and convenient for the purposes as described in Section 2(C)(1).

D. Highways. Means all purposes necessary and convenient to the design, right-of-way acquisition, and construction of highway facilities, including all state highway routes and any other facilities so designated in the Expenditure Plan.

E. Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities. Means all purposes necessary and convenient to the design, right-of-way acquisition, and construction of facilities intended for use by bicycles and pedestrians. Bicycle and pedestrian facilities shall also mean facilities and programs that help to encourage walking and the use of bicycles, such as secure bicycle parking facilities and bicycle and pedestrian promotion and safety education programs.

F. Bonds. Means indebtedness and securities of any kind or class, including but not limited to bonds, notes, bond anticipation notes, and commercial paper.

G. Expenditure Plan. Means the expenditure plan required by Section 132302 of the Public Utilities Code to be included in the transactions and use tax ordinance to be approved by the Commission. The expenditure plan includes the allocation of revenues for each authorized purpose.

H. Regional Transportation Plan. Means the long-range transportation plan for the San Diego region required by Section 65080 of the Government Code to be prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments as the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency.

I. Regional Transportation Improvement Program. Means the five-year programming document required by Section 65080 of the Government Code to be prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments as the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency.

J. Transit Operator. Means any transit district, included transit district, municipal operator, included municipal operator, or transit development board as defined in Public Utilities Code Section 99210.
K. **Regional Comprehensive Plan.** Means the document integrating land use, transportation systems, infrastructure needs, and public investment strategies within a regional framework to be prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments as required by Section 132360 of the Public Utilities Code.

**SECTION 22. EFFECT ON COMMISSION ORDINANCE 87-1:** This Ordinance is intended to extend and expand the provisions of Commission Ordinance 87-1, and shall not be read to supercede Commission Ordinance 87-1. If this Ordinance is not approved by the voters of San Diego County, the provisions of Commission Ordinance 87-1 and all powers, duties, and actions taken thereunder shall remain in full force and effect.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** by the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission, the ___ day of ____________, 2004 by the following vote:

**AYES:**

**NOES:**

**ABSENT:**

_____________________________________
Chairman

STATE OF CALIFORNIA )
) SS
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO )

I, Gary L. Gallegos, the Secretary of the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of an Ordinance adopted by the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission on ______________, 2004 at the time and by the vote stated above, which said Ordinance is on file in the office of the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission.

DATED: ________________, 2004

____________________________________
Secretary
## Attachment 2

### Draft

**TransNet Extension 40-Year Expenditure Plan**

(in millions of 2002 dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Expenditure Plan Component</th>
<th>Total TransNet Requirement (40-year Total)</th>
<th>Percent of Net</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Congestion Relief Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Major Transportation Corridor Improvements:</td>
<td>$6,850</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Freeway, Highway, &amp; Transit Capital Projects (1)</td>
<td>$5,150</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Project Specific Transit Operations</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Freeway, Highway, &amp; Transit Project Environmental Mitigation</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Local System Improvements</td>
<td>$4,480</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Local Street &amp; Road Projects</td>
<td>$3,950</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Local Street &amp; Road Project Environmental Mitigation</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Smart Growth Incentive Competitive Grant Program</td>
<td>$280</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Transit System Improvements -</td>
<td>$2,240</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Continuing Bus/Rail Support and Improvements, including Senior/Disabled/Youth Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passes and Specialized Senior/Disabled Transportation Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>$13,570</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td><strong>Bicycle, Pedestrian &amp; Neighborhood Safety Grant Program</strong></td>
<td>$280</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td><strong>Administration</strong></td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td><strong>Oversight Committee</strong></td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td><strong>TOTAL TransNet Funding Requirement</strong></td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td><strong>TOTAL TransNet Funds Available</strong></td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These categories deducted "off the top" prior to other allocations.

**NOTES:**

(1) Funding reductions for the I-5 North and SR 78 projects under Congestion Relief in the prior draft Expenditure Plan have been restored. Additional funding included for two additional lanes on SR 54/SR 125 from I-805 to SR 94, I-5 from I-8 to I-805, and SR 56 between I-5 and I-15.
## TABLE 1: Congestion Relief Program - Major Transportation Corridor Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>TransNet Proposal</th>
<th></th>
<th>Mitigation Cost**</th>
<th></th>
<th>Net Capital Cost*</th>
<th>Transit Operating Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Capital Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$1,390</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
<td></td>
<td>$24</td>
<td>$2,076</td>
<td>$170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I-5 (INTERNATIONAL BORDER TO I-805)</td>
<td>$1,893</td>
<td></td>
<td>$21</td>
<td>$1,872</td>
<td>$310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I-5 (I-805 TO VANDEGRIFT)</td>
<td>$1,670</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$1,610</td>
<td>$170</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SR-52</td>
<td>$410</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$407</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SR-94 / SR-125</td>
<td>$620</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$610</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SR-54 / SR-125</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$139</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SR-67</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td></td>
<td>$22</td>
<td>$218</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$29</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>SR-78</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$692</td>
<td>$130</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>SR-76</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td></td>
<td>$16</td>
<td>$164</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>SR-56</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$99</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>MID-CITY SAN DIEGO TO DOWNTOWN SAN DIEGO</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$89</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>CORONADO TUNNEL</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>BORDER ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL ALL CORRIDORS</td>
<td>$9,623</td>
<td>$178</td>
<td>$9,445</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(See FIGURE 1)</td>
<td>TOTAL TRANSNET FUNDING REQUIREMENT</td>
<td>$4,650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Costs in millions of 2002 dollars and rounded to the nearest $10 million, with the exception of the matching funds included for the Coronado Tunnel and Border Access Improvement projects.

* Of the total net capital cost of $9,445 million, TransNet funding is assumed to leverage approximately 50% from federal, state, and other sources. Additional matching funds are assumed to compensate for the 100% TransNet funds used for the Environmental Mitigation Program, reducing the TransNet requirement to approximately $4,650 million.

**The figures in this column represent the habitat-related mitigation costs included in the original cost estimates that will be funded out of the Environmental Mitigation Program.
## TABLE 2: I-15 CORRIDOR

### (SEE FIGURE 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Route/Facility From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Capital Cost</th>
<th>Mitigation Cost</th>
<th>Net Capital Cost</th>
<th>Operating Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I-15 SR 163</td>
<td>SR56</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+4ML/MB</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I-15 Centre City Pkwy</td>
<td>SR 78</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+4ML</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I-15 SR94</td>
<td>SR 163</td>
<td>6F/8F</td>
<td>8F+2HOV</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>HOV 2 HOV I-15 SR 78</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>E to S, N to W</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>HOV 2 HOV I-15 SR 94</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>S to W, E to N</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SR94 I-5</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+2HOV</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>BRT Rt 610 via I15/SR94 CAPITAL Escondido Trans Ctr</td>
<td>Downtown San Diego</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>No Kearny Mesa Transitway; uses HOV lanes on I-15 between Qualcomm and SR 52. Builds/upgrades 6 BRT stations, upgrades downtown stations, builds DARs in 4 locations.</td>
<td>$370</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$369</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>BRT Rt 470 via I15/Mira Mesa Blvd CAPITAL Escondido Trans Ctr</td>
<td>Sorrento Mesa</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Escondido to Sorrento Mesa; Uses Rt 610 stations and DARs.</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>&lt;$1</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| BRT capital costs include new and/or improved stations, direct access ramps (DARs), vehicles, right of way, and arterial priority measures. c=cleared, project habitat impacts previously cleared or not included. |  |

| TOTAL FOR CORRIDOR: | $1,400 | $10 | $1,390 | $240 |
## TABLE 3: I-805 CORRIDOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Route/Facility</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Capital Cost</th>
<th>Mitigation Cost</th>
<th>Net Capital Cost</th>
<th>Operating Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+2HOV, Reversible</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+4ML</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$445</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>Mission Valley Viaduct</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+4ML</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+4ML</td>
<td>$380</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>$374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I-805 and SR 54 interchange improvements (E to S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$&lt;1</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>BRT Rt 628 via I805/SR94 CAPITAL</td>
<td>Otay Mesa</td>
<td>Downtown San Diego</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Builds fewer DARs along I-805 reflecting changes to highway improvement; Builds 13 stations and DARs in 4 locations.</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$497</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>SR94 HWAY</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+2HOV</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>BRT Rt 680 via I805/15/SR52 CAPITAL</td>
<td>San Ysidro</td>
<td>Sorrento Mesa</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Builds 1 new station; uses DARs and stations built by routes 610 and 628.</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$&lt;1</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>6F+2HOV</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>HOV 2 HOV</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>W to N, S to E</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL FOR CORRIDOR:** $2,100 $24 $2,076 $170

BRT capital costs include new and/or improved stations, direct access ramps (DARs), vehicles, right of way, and arterial priority measures.
## TABLE 4: I-5 CORRIDOR (International Border to I-805)

(SEE FIGURE 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Route/Facility</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Capital Cost</th>
<th>Mitigation Cost</th>
<th>Net Capital Cost</th>
<th>Operating Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 905</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+2HOV</td>
<td>$130</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>SR 54</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+2HOV</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>$594</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>8F</td>
<td>8F+2HOV (including environmental and preliminary engineering for I-5/I-8 interchange improvements)</td>
<td>$193</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Route 500</td>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conversion to low-floor vehicles, enhanced stations, signal upgrades, extended platforms, grade separations in Chula Vista</td>
<td>$270</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Route 500</td>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5 min peak / 7.5 min offpeak by 2020</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Route 570 MidCoast</td>
<td>Old Town</td>
<td>UCSD/UTC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Extension of light rail transit from Old Town Transit Center to UTC via I-5 and UCSD</td>
<td>$670</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Route 570 MidCoast</td>
<td>Old Town</td>
<td>UCSD/UTC</td>
<td></td>
<td>15 min all day service by 2020</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Route 634</td>
<td>UTC</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Signal priority, queue jumper lanes, other arterial improvements, vehicles, stations</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>&lt;$1</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Route 634</td>
<td>UTC</td>
<td>UCSD</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 minute all day service by 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL FOR CORRIDOR:** $1,893 $21 $1,872 $310

BRT capital costs include new and/or improved stations, direct access ramps (DARs), vehicles, right of way, and arterial priority measures.
### TABLE 5: I-5 CORRIDOR (I-805 to Vandegrift Blvd.)

*(SEE FIGURE 5)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Route/Facility</th>
<th>From/To</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Capital Cost</th>
<th>Mitigation Cost</th>
<th>Net Capital Cost</th>
<th>Operating Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I-5/I-805 Merge</td>
<td>16F-16F+4ML</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I-5 SR 56 Leucadia Blvd</td>
<td>8F-8F+4ML</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$16</td>
<td>$384</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I-5 Leucadia Blvd Vandegrift Blvd</td>
<td>8F-8F+4ML</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$370</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>$359</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>HOV 2 HOV I-5 I-805</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N to N, S to S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>FWY 2 FWY I-5 SR 56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>W to N, S to E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>FWY 2 FWY I-5 SR 78</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>W to S, S to E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I-5 CORRIDOR: Route 398 COASTER/BRT Route 472 (El Camino Real)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAPITAL Improvements</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>Corridor transit improvements that would include some combination of projects from the following: Coaster: Vehicles, stations improvements including parking, double tracking and other improvements, Del Mar tunnel; and BRT (El Camino Real/I-5): Vehicles, stations, signal priority and other arterial improvements along El Camino Real, direct access ramps on I-5 south from Encinitas.</th>
<th>$400</th>
<th>$24</th>
<th>$376</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| OPERATIONS Improvements | - | Coaster: 20 min peak / current offpeak svc by 2016; 20 min peak / 60 min offpeak service by 2025. BRT (El Camino Real/I-5): 15 min peak / 30 min offpeak service by 2020 | - | - | $170 |

**TOTAL FOR CORRIDOR:** $1,670 $60 $1,610 $170

BRT capital costs include new and/or improved stations, direct access ramps (DARs), vehicles, right of way, and arterial priority measures.

C=cleared, project habitat impacts previously cleared or not included.

Major north-south transit service improvements are assumed for this corridor with the primary options being enhanced service on the Coaster and BRT service in the El Camino Real/I-5 Corridor.
### TABLE 6: SR-52

(SEE FIGURE 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Route/Facility</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Capital Cost</th>
<th>Mitigation Cost</th>
<th>Net Capital Cost</th>
<th>Operating Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>6F+2ML (Reversible)</td>
<td>$170</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>SR 52</td>
<td>SR 125</td>
<td>SR 67</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*I-15 - I-805 segment included in I-805 corridor for transit services; I-805/SR 52 HOV2HOV Connector included in I-805 corridor*

| TOTAL FOR CORRIDOR: | $410 | $3 | $407 | $0 |

*c=cleared, project habitat impacts previously cleared or not included.*

### TABLE 7: SR-94 / SR-125

(SEE FIGURE 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Route/Facility</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Capital Cost</th>
<th>Mitigation Cost</th>
<th>Net Capital Cost</th>
<th>Operating Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>SR 94 and SR 125</td>
<td>Interchange</td>
<td>W to N, S to E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*I-805 to I-5 segments included in I-15 and I-805 corridors for transit services*

| 35             | SR 94              | SR 125     | Steele Canyon | 4F/4C-2C | Widen to 6-lane freeway from SR 125 to Avocado Blvd and provide 4-lane conventional highway from Avocado Blvd to Steele Canyon | $90          | $2              | $88              |                |
| 36             | SR 94/SR 125       | I-805      | 1-8         | 8F       | 8F+2HOV                                                                 | $350         | $5              | $345             |                |
| 37             | Route 520          | Orange Line Trolley CAPITAL Improvements | --       |          | Conversion to low-floor vehicles, enhanced stations, signal upgrades, extended platforms, Current headway. | $70          | $1              | $69              |                |

| TOTAL FOR CORRIDOR: | $620 | $10 | $610 | $0 |
## CORRIDOR ANALYSIS FOR TRANSNET EXTENSION

### TABLE 8: SR-54 / SR-125

(SEE FIGURE 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Route/Facility</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>TransNet Extension</th>
<th>Operating Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>SR 54/SR 125</td>
<td>I-805</td>
<td>SR 94</td>
<td>4F+2/6 F</td>
<td>Widen to provide a continuous 6F+2 HOV Facility</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL FOR CORRIDOR: $140 $1 $139 $0

### TABLE 9: SR-67

(SEE FIGURE 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Route/Facility</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>TransNet Extension</th>
<th>Operating Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>SR 67</td>
<td>Mapleview St</td>
<td>Dye Rd</td>
<td>2C</td>
<td>4C - To be constructed with environmental enhancements</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL FOR CORRIDOR: $240 $22 $218 $0

### TABLE 10: I-8 CORRIDOR

(SEE FIGURE 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Route/Facility</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>TransNet Extension</th>
<th>Operating Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>Second St</td>
<td>Los Coches</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL FOR CORRIDOR: $30 $1 $29 $0
## TABLE 11: SR-78

Table 11 presents the analysis for the TransNet Extension of SR-78. The table includes project numbers, routes, facilities, existing conditions, improvements, and associated costs. The data includes capital costs, mitigation costs, net capital costs, and operating costs. The table highlights capital improvements that would include some combination of projects from the following: Sprinter: double tracking, North County Fair extension, some grade separations; and BRT (Palomar Airport Rd): vehicles, signal priority and other arterial improvements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Route/Facility Details</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Capital Cost</th>
<th>Mitigation Cost</th>
<th>Net Capital Cost</th>
<th>Operating Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>SR 78 I-5 I-15</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>6F+2HOV</td>
<td>6F+2HOV</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>FWY 2 FWY I-5 SR 78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Included in I-5 North Coast Corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>HOV 2 HOV I-15 SR 78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Included in I-15 Corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parameters:**
- Capital Costs: $500
- Mitigation Costs: $5
- Net Capital Costs: $495
- Operating Costs: $0

**Notes:**
- BRT capital costs include new and/or improved stations, direct access ramps (DARs), vehicles, right of way, and arterial priority measures.
- Major east-west transit service improvements are assumed for this corridor with the primary options being enhanced service on the Sprinter and BRT service in the Palomar Airport Rd / San Marcos Blvd Corridor.

---

## TABLE 12: SR-76

Table 12 presents the analysis for the TransNet Extension of SR-76. The table includes project numbers, routes, facilities, existing conditions, improvements, and associated costs. The data includes capital costs, mitigation costs, net capital costs, and operating costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Route/Facility Details</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Capital Cost</th>
<th>Mitigation Cost</th>
<th>Net Capital Cost</th>
<th>Operating Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>SR 76 Melrose Dr I-15</td>
<td>2C</td>
<td></td>
<td>4C -</td>
<td>(Mission Road to I-15 segment to be constructed with environmental enhancements)</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>$16</td>
<td>$164</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parameters:**
- Capital Costs: $180
- Mitigation Costs: $16
- Net Capital Costs: $164
- Operating Costs: $0

**Notes:**
- Major east-west transit service improvements are assumed for this corridor with the primary options being enhanced service on the Sprinter and BRT service in the Palomar Airport Rd / San Marcos Blvd Corridor.
## CORRIDOR ANALYSIS FOR TRANSNET EXTENSION

### TABLE 13: SR-56

**SEE FIGURE 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Route/Facility</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>TransNet Extension Cost</th>
<th>Mitigation Cost</th>
<th>Net Capital Cost</th>
<th>Operating Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>SR 56</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-15</td>
<td>4F</td>
<td>6F</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$99</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL FOR CORRIDOR: $100 $1 $99 $0

### TABLE 14: MID-CITY SAN DIEGO TO DOWNTOWN SAN DIEGO

**SEE FIGURE 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Route/Facility</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>TransNet Extension Cost</th>
<th>Mitigation Cost</th>
<th>Net Capital Cost</th>
<th>Operating Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>BRT Showcase Rt 611 via El Cajon&amp;Park Blvds  CAPITAL</td>
<td>SDSU</td>
<td>Downtown San Diego</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Signal priority, queue jumper lanes, other arterial improvements, vehicles; builds 13 stations and upgrades to downtown stations</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>BRT Showcase Rt 611 via El Cajon&amp;Park Blvds  OPERATIONS</td>
<td>SDSU</td>
<td>Downtown San Diego</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10 min peak / 15 min offpeak by 2006</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL FOR CORRIDOR: $90 $1 $89 $80

BRT capital costs include new and/or improved stations, direct access ramps (DARs), vehicles, right of way, and arterial priority measures.
### TABLE 15: CORONADO TUNNEL

(SEE FIGURE 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Route/Facility</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Capital Cost</th>
<th>Mitigation Cost</th>
<th>Net Capital Cost</th>
<th>Operating Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>SR75/SR 282</td>
<td>Glorietta Blvd</td>
<td>Alameda Blvd</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Tunnel Construction Match Only</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c=cleared, project habitat impacts previously cleared or not included.

**TOTAL FOR CORRIDOR:** $25 $0 $25 $0

### TABLE 16: BORDER ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS

(SEE FIGURE 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Route/Facility</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Capital Cost</th>
<th>Mitigation Cost</th>
<th>Net Capital Cost</th>
<th>Operating Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Border Access Improvements</td>
<td>Miscellaneous improvements to enhance access in the border area.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Construction Match</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL FOR CORRIDOR:** $25 $0 $25 $0

c=cleared, project habitat impacts previously cleared or not included.
Figure 1
PROPOSED TRANSNET PROJECTS
April 2004

See Table 1
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

I-15 CORRIDOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>COST ($ Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-15 (SR-163 – SR-56)</td>
<td>$220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15 (Centre City Parkway – SR-78)</td>
<td>$120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15 (SR-94 – SR-163)</td>
<td>$197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15 / SR-78 (HOV – HOV)</td>
<td>$197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-15 / SR-94 (HOV – HOV)</td>
<td>$148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-94 (I-5 – I-15)</td>
<td>$79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT (Escondido – Downtown)</td>
<td>$519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT (Escondido – Sorrento Mesa)</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL COST: $1,630

See Table 2
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

I-805 CORRIDOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>COST ( Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-805 (SR-905 – SR-54)</td>
<td>$148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-805 (SR-54 – I-8)</td>
<td>$445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-805 (Mission Valley)</td>
<td>$246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-805 (I-8 – I-5)</td>
<td>$374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-805 / SR-54 (Interchange)</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT (Otay Mesa – Downtown)</td>
<td>$617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-94 (I-805 – I-15)</td>
<td>$69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT (San Ysidro – Sorrento Mesa)</td>
<td>$120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-52 (I-15 – I-805)</td>
<td>$69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-805 / SR-52 (HOV – HOV)</td>
<td>$148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL COST: $2,246

See Table 3
PROJECT DESCRIPTION
I-5 CORRIDOR
(International Border to I-805)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>COST ($ Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I-5 (SR-905 – SR-54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I-5 (SR-54 – I-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I-5 (I-8 – I-805)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Blue Line Trolley Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Mid-Coast Transit Guideway Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Mid-Coast Super Loop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL COST: $2,182

See Table 4

Figure 4
PROPOSED TRANSNET PROJECTS
April 2004
I-5 CORRIDOR
(International Border to I-805)

OVERALL NETWORK
- Transit
- Managed/HOV Lanes
- General Purpose Lanes
- General Purpose Lanes with Environmental Enhancements
- Freeway Connectors
- HOV to HOV Connectors
- Border Access
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PROJECT DESCRIPTION
I-5 CORRIDOR
(I-805 to Vandegrift Blvd.)

PROJECT COST
($ Millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>COST ($ Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>$30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>$384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>$359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>$177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>$136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>$148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>$546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$1,780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Table 5

Figure 5
PROPOSED TRANSNET PROJECTS
April 2004
I-5 CORRIDOR
(I-805 to Vandegrift Blvd.)

OVERALL NETWORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Managed/HOV Lanes</th>
<th>General Purpose Lanes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Purpose Lanes with Environmental Enhancements

Freeway Connectors
HOV to HOV Connectors
Border Access

Figure 7
November 2003
**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

**EAST COUNTY CORRIDORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>COST ($ Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32 SR-52 (I-15 – SR-125)</td>
<td>$167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 SR-52 (SR-125 – SR-67)</td>
<td>$240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 SR-94 / SR-125 Connectors</td>
<td>$108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 SR-94 (SR-125 – Steele Canyon)</td>
<td>$88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 SR-94 / 125 (I-805 – I-8)</td>
<td>$345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Orange Line Trolley Improvements</td>
<td>$69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 SR-54 / SR-125 (I-805 – SR-94)</td>
<td>$139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 SR-67 (Mapleview – Dye Rd.)</td>
<td>$218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 I-8 (2nd Street – Los Coches)</td>
<td>$29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL COST:** $1,403

See Tables 6, 7, 8, 9 & 10
Figure 7
PROPOSED TRANSNET PROJECTS
April 2004

ADDITIONAL CORRIDORS
- Transit
- Managed/HOV Lanes
- General Purpose Lanes
- General Purpose Lanes with Environmental Enhancements
- Freeway Connectors
- HOV to HOV Connectors
- Border Access

OVERALL NETWORK
- Transit
- Managed/HOV Lanes
- General Purpose Lanes
- General Purpose Lanes with Environmental Enhancements
- Freeway Connectors
- HOV to HOV Connectors
- Border Access

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
ADDITIONAL CORRIDORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COST ($ Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR-78 (I-5 – I-15) East-West Corridor Transit Improvements: SPRINTER / BRT (Palomar Airport Rd.)</td>
<td>$495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-76 (Melrose – I-15)</td>
<td>$327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-56 (I-5 – I-15)</td>
<td>$164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT (SDSU – Downtown)</td>
<td>$99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado Tunnel (Construction only)</td>
<td>$169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border Access Improvements</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL COST: $1,304

See Tables 11 – 16
1. The TransNet Extension Expenditure Plan shall include a funding allocation category entitled “Transportation Project Environmental Mitigation Program.”

2. The Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP) shall include an allocation for the estimated direct costs for mitigation of upland and wetland habitat impacts for regional transportation projects included in the proposed TransNet Expenditure Plan, as well as for regional projects that are included in the adopted 2030 Regional Transportation Plan Mobility Network. The “mitigation costs,” including land acquisition, restoration, management, and monitoring, for these regional projects are estimated at approximately $450 million. Funds for direct mitigation, management and monitoring of these projects shall be placed into a “Transportation Project Mitigation Fund,” where they can be used as partial funding for regional acquisition, habitat management and monitoring activities related to implementation of the Multiple Species Conservation Plan Program (MSCP), North County the Multiple Habitat Conservation Plan Program (MHCP), and future amendments thereto.

3. The Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP) shall also include an allocation for the estimated direct costs for mitigation of upland and wetland habitat impacts for local transportation projects, in a total amount not to exceed $200 million. Funds for direct mitigation of these projects shall also be placed in the “Transportation Project Mitigation Fund” outlined in Section 2 above.

4. The Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP) shall also include a funding allocation for the estimated economic benefits of incorporating specified regional and local transportation projects into applicable habitat conservation plans, thereby allowing mitigation requirements for covered species to be fixed, and allowing mitigation requirements to be met through purchase of land in advance of need in larger blocks at a lower cost. The benefits of this approach are estimated at approximately $200 million ($150 million for regional projects and $50 million for local projects). This amount will be allocated to a “Regional Habitat Conservation Fund,” which will be made available for regional habitat acquisition, management and monitoring activities necessary to implement the regional habitat conservation plans MSCP and MHCP described in Section 2 above. Therefore, the total funding allocation for the Environmental Mitigation Program shall be set at $850 million.

5. SANDAG shall work with the Wildlife Agencies (California Department of Fish and Game and the US Fish and Wildlife Service) and permit holders under the existing regional habitat conservation plans MSCP and MHCP to establish a regional entity that will be responsible for the allocation of funding included in the “Regional Habitat Conservation Fund” in accordance with the goals and policies of said plans. In addition, this entity will provide recommendations regarding the structure and content of future funding measures as described in Section 10 below.

6. Land acquisitions, and management and monitoring activities, that result from the implementation of this program shall receive credit toward the “regional funding obligations,” if any, under the applicable habitat conservation plans, with the exception
that land acquisitions in the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) planning area (as designated and permitted as of April 9, 2004) shall not count toward the regional funding obligation for land acquisition (currently estimated at 10,267 acres) established for that program.

7. In order to provide the economic benefits of the proposed EMP, the participating local jurisdictions shall apply for, and the Wildlife Agencies shall process, requests for any necessary amendments to the previously adopted Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP) and related agreements and permits, to include Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) transportation projects as “covered projects” under this plan pursuant to the standards in effect at that time for the remaining life of those plans. For projects in the planning areas of the North County Multiple Habitat Conservation Plan (MHCP) and proposed Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) North County Suburban for unincorporated North County, the participating local jurisdictions shall include RTP projects in their proposed plans and implementing agreements, and the Wildlife Agencies will process those plans and agreements so as to provide coverage for RTP projects for the life of those plans.

8. The expenditure of funds included in this allocation category shall be phased over time in order to allow goals of regional habitat acquisition, management and monitoring to be met, while also meeting the requirements for individual transportation projects. The timeframe by which the phasing will be done will allow for the early acquisition of land within the first 10 years of the permits and/or amended permits with corresponding funds available for management and monitoring. In addition, mitigation land for projects in the planning area covered in the proposed MSCP plan for unincorporated North County shall be purchased within the multiple habitat planning area designated for that plan, while mitigation for projects in the adopted MSCP and MHCP planning areas shall be purchased within the multiple habitat planning areas designated for those plans, unless otherwise approved by SANDAG, the Wildlife Agencies, and affected permit holders. As transportation projects are completed, if it is determined that the actual direct costs for mitigation of upland and wetland habitat impacts are less than those which were estimated in Section 2 above, those cost savings shall be transferred to the “Regional Habitat Conservation Fund” described in Section 4 above.

9. In addition to the direct economic benefits associated with inclusion of these projects in the applicable habitat conservation plans (MSCP and MHCP), SANDAG and the Wildlife Agencies both recognize the value of expedited processing of environmental documents for individual transportation projects by all involved Federal, State, and regional agencies. Therefore, SANDAG and the Wildlife Agencies shall actively support efforts to accomplish complete review of environmental documents within reduced timeframes. To the extent that the processing time required for such documents is reduced, the value of expedited processing shall be allocated equally between transportation-related expenditures and the “Regional Habitat Conservation Fund”. SANDAG and the Wildlife Agencies will develop guidelines for implementing this principle within one year of the passage of the TransNet extension.

10. SANDAG agrees to act on additional regional funding measures (a ballot measure and/or other secure funding commitments) to meet the long-term requirements for implementing habitat conservation plans in the San Diego region, within the timeframe necessary to allow a ballot measure to be considered by the voters no later than four years after passage of the TransNet Extension. In the event that such future funding measures generate funding to
fully meet regional habitat acquisition and management requirements, SANDAG is authorized to reallocate excess funds included in the “Regional Habitat Conservation Fund” to local transportation projects.

11. In the event that SANDAG and its member agencies are not able to obtain coverage for transportation projects in applicable habitat conservation plans the MSCP and MHCP in accordance with the principles set forth above, the funding allocations set forth in this program shall be made available to meet habitat mitigation requirements of transportation projects, either through an alternative program that is acceptable to SANDAG, its member agencies, and the Wildlife Agencies, or through environmental review and permitting of individual projects under existing regulatory procedures.
Attachment 4

TransNet Expenditure Plan:

Environmental Enhancement Criteria Mitigating Highway 67, 76, and 94 Expansion Impacts

Segments of Highways SR 67, SR 76 and SR 94 are proposed for expansion from two to four lanes through funding identified in the TransNet Expenditure Plan. The proposed expansions will have substantial direct and indirect impacts to plant and animal species and to the regional wildlife movement corridors bisected by the roads. These corridors are essential “infrastructure” for our region’s nationally-recognized habitat preservation plans.

Very high levels of road kill are a significant existing condition on all of these highway segments, which could be exacerbated by the increased traffic along the expanded highways should they be widened. Direct and indirect impacts to sensitive plant and animal populations, and to the function of the wildlife corridors, should be mitigated in order to produce an on-site “net-benefit” to species and to the movement of wildlife along these wildlife corridors.

In order to accomplish this objective, it is necessary that the adopted TransNet Expenditure Plan include policy language and directives that insure the “net benefit” mitigation standard is met. This will require a comprehensive baseline analysis of existing and future conditions, adoption of measures to mitigate direct and indirect impacts to species, adoption of measures to accommodate species-specific wildlife movement through the corridors, and implementation of capital project designs that can reduce impacts.

Biological analysis and recommendations need to be consistent with Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) and Multiple Habitat Conservation Program (MHCP) goals and objectives, data, and protocols. Analysis will commence at the time of, or prior to, TransNet funding availability.

Key road segments:

- SR67, Mapleview to Dye Road
- SR76, Melrose to I-15
- SR94, Jamacha Road to Steele Canyon Road
Providing new transportation services and facilities is an expensive undertaking. Not providing them, however, will result in a decreased quality of life due to significant increases in traffic congestion, degrading mobility throughout the San Diego region. As SANDAG's Regional Transportation Plan explains, our challenge is especially critical for the Regional Artery System, which is forecast to carry an increasingly significant amount of traffic volume. The SANDAG Board recognizes the need to establish a new Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program (RTCIP) that ensures future development will contribute its share toward funding and mitigating new traffic impacts on the Regional Artery System.

A. Funding Program

1. Section 9 of the TransNet Ordinance requires that local jurisdictions establish a program or mechanism that provides $2,000 per new residential unit for the purpose of funding the Regional Artery System, including SR75. For purposes of the RTCIP, the Regional Artery System is defined in SANDAG's most recent and adopted Regional Transportation Plan. Each jurisdiction's program or mechanism shall be known as a “Funding Program.” Local jurisdictions may choose to implement a Funding Program through a development impact fee program or other exactions from the private sector.

2. In the event a jurisdiction(s) chooses to establish a development impact fee program to meet its Funding Program requirements, said program shall be consistent with Government Code Section 66000 et seq.

3. SANDAG will be responsible for producing the required nexus study to satisfy the requirements of California Government Code Section 66000 et seq. for Funding Programs utilizing a development impact fee. The first draft of the regional nexus study shall be presented to the SANDAG Board within nine months of the successful reauthorization of TransNet.

4. In no case will non-residential development be subject to a development impact fee to meet the requirements of Section 9 of the TransNet Ordinance.

5. Each jurisdiction’s Funding Program shall be submitted for review by the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) referred to in Section 11 of the TransNet Ordinance prior to April 1, 2008, approved by Regional Transportation Commission by June 1, 2008 and shall become operative on July 1, 2008. Failure to submit a Funding Program for review by the ITOC by April 1 of any year beginning April 1, 2008 shall result in that jurisdiction losing eligibility to receive funding for local streets and roads under Section 4(D)(1) of the Ordinance until July 1 of the following year.
B. Purpose

1. The purpose of each jurisdiction’s Funding Program is to provide additional revenue to fund those facility and service improvements on the Regional Arterial System necessitated by development of newly constructed residences.

C. Fee Adjustment

1. The fee amount per residential unit shall be adjusted by SANDAG on July 1 of each year beginning July 1, 2009 based upon the Engineering Construction Cost Index as published by the Engineering News Record or similar cost of construction index.

2. Any increase shall not exceed the percentage increase set forth in the construction index. In no event, however, shall the increase be less than two percent per year. The purpose of this annual adjustment is to retain purchasing power in anticipation of future inflation.

D. Expenditure of Funding Program Revenues

1. Revenues collected under Section 9 of the TransNet Ordinance shall be deposited into each jurisdiction’s Funding Program for use on the Regional Arterial System as described in this subsection D.

2. Revenue collected through the Funding Programs shall be used to construct transportation improvements on the Regional Arterial System such as new arterial roadway lanes, turning lanes, reconfigured freeway-arterial interchanges, railroad grade separations and new regional express bus services, or similar types of improvements, preliminary and final engineering, right of way acquisition, and construction that will be needed to accommodate future travel demand generated by new development throughout the San Diego region. A reasonable portion of the program revenue, up to a maximum of three percent, may be used for fund administration.

3. Expenditure of the Funding Program revenues shall be in a manner consistent with the expenditure priorities in SANDAG’s most recent and adopted long-range Regional Transportation Plan and with Section 5 of the TransNet Ordinance. To maximize the effective use of these Funding Program revenues, they may be transferred, loaned, or exchanged in accordance with the intent requirements of Section 7 of the TransNet Ordinance.

E. Exemptions

The following development types shall be exempt from the Funding Program requirements:

1. New moderate, low, very low, and extremely low income residential units as defined in Health & Safety Code sections 50079.5, 50093, 50105, 50106, and by reference in Government Code section 65585.1.
2. Government/public buildings, public schools and public facilities.

3. The rehabilitation and/or reconstruction of any legal, residential structure and/or the replacement of a previously existing dwelling unit.

4. All new, rehabilitated, and/or reconstructed non-residential structures.

5. Development Projects which are the subject of a Public Facilities Development Agreements (pursuant to applicable Government Code Sections) prior to the effective date of this ordinance, wherein the imposition of new fees are expressly prohibited, provided, however that, if the term of such a Development Agreement is extended after the effective date of this Ordinance July 1, 2008, the requirements of this funding program shall be imposed.

6. Guest Dwellings

7. Additional residential units located on the same parcel regulated by the provisions of any agricultural zoning.

8. Kennels and Catteries established in conjunction with an existing residential unit.

9. The sanctuary building of a church, mosque, synagogue, or other house of worship, eligible for property tax exemption.

10. Residential units that have been issued a building permit prior to July 1, 2008.

11. Condominium conversions

F. Credits

1. If a developer funds or constructs improvements on the Regional Arterial System and/or as that arise out of SANDAG’s Congestion Management Program, the developer shall receive credit for the costs associated with the arterial improvements, offsetting the revenue requirements of the Funding Program. Such credits shall only apply to the Funding Program for the jurisdiction in which the residential unit was developed.

2. In special circumstances, when a developer constructs off-site improvements such as an interchange, bridge, or railroad grade separation, credits shall be determined by the local jurisdiction in consultation with the developer.

3. The amount of the credit shall not exceed the revenue requirements of the most current Funding Program or actual cost, whichever is less.

4. The local jurisdictions shall compare facilities in their Funding Program, against the Regional Arterial System and eliminate any overlap in its Funding Program except where there is a legally recognized benefit district established.
5. If there is a legally recognized benefit district established, the local agency may credit that portion of the facility identified in both programs against its Funding Program.

G. Procedures for the Levy, Collection and Disposition of Funding Program Revenues

1. Each jurisdiction shall establish and implement a procedure to levy and collect its required contribution to the RTCIP in its Funding Program document.

2. Each jurisdiction shall determine its own schedule for collecting and/or contributing private sector exactions to its Funding Program. This schedule shall be kept up-to-date and provided to SANDAG and the Independent Taxpayers Oversight Committee each year at the time of the annual review and audit. Each jurisdiction must submit its Funding Program documents, including an expenditure plan and financial records pertaining to its Funding Program, to the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee for a review and audit by July 1 of each year beginning July 1, 2009. The Taxpayer Independent Oversight Committee shall review each jurisdiction’s Funding Program consistent with its auditing role as described in Section 11 of the Ordinance and the Statement of Understanding referenced in that Section.

3. Funding Program revenue requirements shall not be waived.

4. Each jurisdiction shall have up to but no more than seven fiscal years to expend Funding Program revenues on the Regional Arterial Systems projects. The seven year term shall commence on the first day of July following the jurisdiction’s receipt of the revenue. At the time of the review and audit by the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee, each jurisdiction collecting a development impact fee to meet the requirements of its Funding Program shall provide the Committee with written findings for any expended, unexpended and uncommitted fees in their Program Fund and demonstrates a reasonable relationship between the fee and the purpose for which it was charged, consistent with the requirements of Government Code Section 66000 et seq. Unless a planned need for such fees can be demonstrated and a justification for the delay can be provided that is acceptable to the Taxpayer Independent Oversight Committee, the unexpended or uncommitted portion of the Funding Program revenues shall be transferred to the Regional Transportation Commission (SANDAG) to be expended within three years on qualified projects within the same subregion. Contributions to the Funding Program not committed or expended by the tenth anniversary date of the July 1 following collection shall be refunded to the current record owner of the development project on a prorated basis. In no case will a refund be more than was initially contributed to the Funding Program.

5. The Independent Taxpayers Oversight Committee identified in Section 11 of the TransNet Ordinance shall be responsible for issuing an annual audit statement on each jurisdiction’s compliance with requirements of Section 9 of the TransNet Ordinance by October 1 of each year beginning October 1, 2009. SANDAG will report to the Board on the RTCIP and the annual audit statement in November of each year beginning in November 2009.
STATEMENT OF UNDERSTANDING REGARDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INDEPENDENT TAXPAYER OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE FOR THE TRANSNET PROGRAM

Purpose of the ITOC

The Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) is intended to provide an increased level of accountability for expenditures made under the TransNet Extension, in addition to the independent annual fiscal and compliance audits required under the existing TransNet program. The ITOC should function in an independent, open and transparent manner to ensure that all voter mandates are carried out as required in the Ordinance and Expenditure Plan, and to develop positive, constructive recommendations for improvements and enhancements to the financial integrity and performance of the TransNet program.

Intent of the ITOC as a Functional Partner to SANDAG

The TransNet Ordinance contains a summary of the ITOC’s role and responsibilities consistent with the above Purpose. In this document, additional and supplementary details with regard to the ITOC are delineated. These pertain to the process for selecting members of ITOC, terms and conditions governing membership, responsibilities, funding and administration, and conflict of interest provisions.

It is noteworthy that these details have been developed in a cooperative process between SANDAG and representatives of the San Diego County Taxpayers Association, and with the involvement of other transportation professionals within the region. This document is understood to provide the basis for describing how the ITOC will function once the Ordinance is approved.

In addition to the details outlined in this document the intent that provides the foundation for the desired partnership between ITOC and SANDAG, as viewed by the principal authors, is summarized as follows:

- **Resource**—it is the intent that the ITOC will serve as an independent resource to assist in SANDAG’s implementation of TransNet projects and programs. The Committee’s membership is designed to provide to SANDAG a group of professionals who, collectively, can offer SANDAG the benefit of their experience to advance the timely and efficient implementation of TransNet projects and programs. The ITOC will work in a public way to ensure all deliberations are conducted in an open manner. Regular reports from the ITOC to the SANDAG Board of Directors (or policy committees) are expected with regard to program and project delivery, and overall performance.

- **Productive**—it is the intent that the ITOC will rely upon data and processes available at SANDAG, studies initiated by the ITOC, and other relevant data generated by reputable sources. It is understood, however, that SANDAG will be continuously striving to improve the reliability of data and to update analytical and modeling processes to be consistent with the state-of-the-
art, and that the ITOC will be kept abreast of any such efforts, and invited to participate in development of such updates in a review capacity.

- **Cost-efficient**—it is the intent that the ITOC will not add cost burden to SANDAG’s implementation of the TransNet program and projects. Rather, through a cooperative and productive working relationship between ITOC and the SANDAG implementation team, it is the objective that costs will be saved.

- **Flexible**—it is the intent that the ITOC will assist SANDAG to be opportunistic to take advantage of changing situations in the future with regard to technologies and transportation developments. Therefore, the provisions contained below are viewed through 2038 based upon a 2004 perspective and are not meant to be unduly restrictive on ITOC’s and SANDAG’s roles and responsibilities.

### Membership and Selection Process

1. **Membership:** There shall be seven ITOC voting members with the characteristics described below. The intent is to have one member representing each of the specified areas of expertise. If, however, after a good faith effort, qualified individuals have not been identified for one or more of the areas of expertise, then no more than two members from one or more of the remaining areas of expertise may be selected. For each of the areas of expertise listed below, an individual representing one of the region’s colleges or universities with a comparable level of academic experience also would be eligible for consideration.

   - A professional in the field of municipal/public finance and/or budgeting with a minimum of ten years in a relevant and senior decision making position in the public or private sector.
   - A licensed architect, civil engineer or traffic engineer with demonstrated experience of ten years or more in the fields of transportation and/or urban design in government or the private sector.
   - A professional with demonstrated experience of ten years or more in real estate, land economics, and/or right-of-way acquisition.
   - A professional with demonstrated experience of ten years or more in the management of large-scale construction projects.
   - A licensed engineer with appropriate credentials in the field of transportation project design or construction and a minimum of ten years experience in a relevant and senior decision making position in the government or private sector.
   - The chief executive officer or person in a similar senior-level decision making position, of a major private sector employer with demonstrated experience in leading a large organization.
   - A professional in biology or environmental science with demonstrated experience of ten years or more with environmental regulations and major project mitigation requirements and/or habitat acquisition and management.

**Ex-Officio Members:** SANDAG Executive Director and the San Diego County Auditor

The criteria established for the voting members of the ITOC are intended to provide the skills and experience needed for the ITOC to carry out its responsibilities and to play a valuable and
constructive role in the ongoing improvement and enhancement of the TransNet program. Applications will be requested from individuals interested in serving on the ITOC through an open, publicly noticed solicitation process.

2. Technical Screening Committee: A technical screening committee will be established to review applications received from interested individuals. This committee will consist of three members selected by the SANDAG Executive Director from high-level professional staff of local, regional, state or federal transportation agencies outside of the San Diego region, or from one of the region’s colleges or universities in a transportation-related field, or a combination thereof. The committee will develop a list of candidates determined to be qualified to serve on the ITOC based on the criteria established for the open position(s) on the ITOC. The technical screening committee will recommend two candidates for each open position from the list of qualified candidates for consideration by the Selection Committee. The recommendations shall be made within 30 days of the noticed closing date for applications.

3. Selection Committee: A selection committee shall be established to select the ITOC members from the list of qualified candidates recommended by the technical screening committee. The selection committee shall consist of the following:

- Two members of the County of San Diego Board of Supervisors
- The Mayor of the City of San Diego
- A mayor from the Cities of Chula Vista, Coronado, Imperial Beach, or National City selected by the mayors of those cities.
- A mayor from the Cities of El Cajon, La Mesa, Lemon Grove, or Santee selected by the mayors of those cities.
- A mayor from the Cities of Carlsbad, Del Mar, Encinitas, Oceanside, or Solana Beach selected by the mayors of those cities.
- A mayor from the Cities of Escondido, Poway, San Marcos, or Vista selected by the mayors of those cities.

The selection of ITOC members shall be made within 30 days of the receipt of recommendations from the technical screening committee. All meetings of the selection committee shall be publicly noticed and conducted in full compliance with the requirements of the Brown Act. Should the selection committee be unable to reach agreement on a candidate from the qualified candidates recommended by the technical screening committee, the selection committee shall request the technical screening committee to recommend two additional qualified candidates for consideration.

Terms and Conditions for ITOC members

- ITOC members shall serve a term of four years, except that initial appointments may be staggered with terms of two to four years.
- ITOC members shall serve without compensation except for direct expenses related to the work of the ITOC.
- In no case shall any member serve more than eight years on the ITOC.
If and when vacancies in the membership of the ITOC occur, the same selection process as outlined above shall be followed to select a replacement to fill the remainder of the term. At the completion of a term, eligible incumbent members will need to apply for reappointment for another term.

Term limits for ITOC members should be staggered to prevent significant turnover at any one time. The initial appointment process should be based on this staggered term limit concept.

ITOC Responsibilities

The ITOC shall have the following responsibilities:

1. Conduct an annual fiscal and compliance audit of all TransNet-funded activities using the services of an independent fiscal auditor to assure compliance with the voter-approved Ordinance and Expenditure Plan. This annual audit will cover all recipients of TransNet funds during the fiscal year and will evaluate compliance with the maintenance of effort requirement and any other applicable requirements. The audits will identify expenditures made for each project in the prior fiscal year and will include the accumulated expenses and revenues for ongoing, multi-year projects.

2. Prepare an annual report to the SANDAG Board of Directors presenting the results of the annual audit process. The report should include an assessment of the consistency of the expenditures of TransNet funds with the Ordinance and Expenditure Plan and any recommendations for improving the financial operation and integrity of the program for consideration by the SANDAG Board of Directors. This consistency evaluation will include a review of expenditures by project type for each local jurisdiction. The ITOC shall share the initial findings of the independent fiscal audits and its recommendations with the SANDAG Transportation Committee 60 days prior to their release to resolve inconsistencies and technical issues related to the ITOC’s draft report and recommendations. Once this review has taken place, the ITOC shall make any final amendments it deems appropriate to its report and recommendations, and adopt its report for submission directly to the SANDAG Board of Directors and the public. The ITOC shall strive to be as objective and accurate as possible in whatever final report it adopts. Upon completion by the ITOC, the report shall be presented to the SANDAG Board of Directors at its next regular meeting and shall be made available to the public.

3. Conduct triennial performance audits of SANDAG and other agencies involved in the implementation of TransNet-funded projects and programs to review project delivery, cost control, schedule adherence and related activities. The review should include consideration of changes to contracting, construction, permitting and related processes that could improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the expenditure of TransNet revenues. These performance audits shall be conducted using the services of an independent performance auditor and should include a review of the ITOC’s performance. A draft of the ITOC’s report and recommendations regarding the performance audits shall be made available to the SANDAG Transportation Committee at least 60 days before its final adoption by the ITOC to resolve inconsistencies and technical issues related to the ITOC’s draft report and recommendations. Once this review has taken place, the ITOC shall make any final amendments it deems appropriate to its report and related recommendations, and adopt its report for presentation directly to the SANDAG Board of Directors and the public. The ITOC shall strive to be as
objective and constructive as possible in the text and presentation of the performance audits. Upon completion by the ITOC, the report shall be presented to the SANDAG Board of Directors at its next regular meeting and shall be made available to the public.

4. Provide recommendations to the SANDAG Board of Directors regarding any proposed amendments to the Ordinance and Expenditure Plan.

5. Provide recommendations as part of the 10-year review process. This process provides an opportunity to undertake a comprehensive review of the TransNet program every 10 years and to make recommendations for improving the program over the subsequent 10 years. This review process should take into consideration the results of the TransNet-funded improvements as compared to the performance standards established through the Regional Transportation Plan and the Regional Comprehensive Plan.

6. Participate in the ongoing refinement of SANDAG’s transportation system performance measurement process and the project evaluation criteria used in development of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and in prioritizing projects for funding in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program. The focus of this effort will be on TransNet-funded projects. Based on the periodic updates to the RTP, as required by state and federal law, the oversight committee shall develop a report to the SANDAG Transportation Committee, the SANDAG Board of Directors and the public providing recommendations for possible improvements and modifications to the TransNet program.

7. On an annual basis, review ongoing SANDAG system performance evaluations, including SANDAG’s “State of the Commute” report, and provide an independent analysis of information included in that report. This evaluation process is expected to include such factors as level of service measurements by roadway segment and by time of day, throughput in major travel corridors, and travel time comparisons by mode between major trip origins and destinations. Such information will be used as a tool in the RTP development process.

8. Review and comment on the programming of TransNet revenues in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). This provides an opportunity for the ITOC to raise concerns regarding the eligibility of projects proposed for funding before any expenditures are made. In addition to a general eligibility review, this effort should focus on significant cost increases and/or scope changes on the major corridor projects identified in the Ordinance and Expenditure Plan.

9. Review proposed debt financings to ensure that the benefits of the proposed financing for accelerating project delivery, avoiding future cost escalation, and related factors exceed issuance and interest costs.

10. Review the major Congestion Relief projects identified in the Ordinance for performance in terms of cost control and schedule adherence on a quarterly basis.

In carrying out its responsibilities, the ITOC shall conduct its reviews in such a manner that does not cause unnecessary project delays, while providing sufficient time to ensure that adequate analysis can be completed to allow the ITOC to make objective recommendations and to provide the public with information about the implementation of the TransNet program.
ITOC Funding and Administration

1. All costs incurred in administering the activities of the ITOC, including related fiscal and performance audit costs, shall be paid annually from the proceeds of the TransNet sales tax. The funds made available to the ITOC shall not exceed $250,000 annually, as adjusted for inflation annually for the duration of the program. Any funds not utilized in one fiscal year shall remain available for expenditure in subsequent years as part of the annual budget process.

2. The expenditures of the ITOC shall be audited annually as part of the same fiscal audit process used for all other TransNet-funded activities.

3. The process for selecting the initial ITOC members shall be started no later than April 1 of the year following the passage of the Ordinance by the voters. Because the funding for this activity would not be available until Fiscal Year 2008-09, the ITOC activities during the initial transition period will be phased in to the extent possible within the budget constraints of the one percent administrative cap under the current TransNet Ordinance. Given the thirty-four-year duration of the TransNet tax extension, the ITOC shall continue as long as funds from the current authorization remain available.

4. An annual ITOC operating budget shall be prepared and submitted to the SANDAG Board of Directors for its approval 90 days prior to the beginning of each fiscal year.

5. All ITOC meetings shall be public meetings conducted in full compliance with the Brown Act. The ITOC will meet on a regular basis, at least quarterly, to carry out its roles and responsibilities.

6. SANDAG Directors and staff will fully cooperate with and provide necessary support to the ITOC to ensure that it successfully carries out its duties and obligations, but should limit involvement to the provision of information required by the ITOC to ensure the independence of the ITOC as it carries out its review of the TransNet program and develops its recommendations for improvements.

7. ITOC members and their designated auditors shall have full and timely access to all public documents, records and data with respect to all TransNet funds and expenditures.

8. All consultants hired by the ITOC shall be selected on an open and competitive basis with solicitation of proposals from the widest possible number of qualified firms as prescribed by SANDAG’s procedures for the procurement of professional services. The scope of work of all such consultant work shall be adopted by the ITOC prior to any such solicitation.

9. SANDAG shall provide meeting space, supplies and incidental materials adequate for the ITOC to carry out its responsibilities and conduct its affairs. Such administrative support shall not be charged against the funds set aside for the administration of the ITOC provided under No. 1 above.
Conflict of Interest

The ITOC shall be subject to SANDAG’s conflict of interest policies. ITOC members shall have no legal action pending against SANDAG and are prohibited from acting in any commercial activity directly or indirectly involving SANDAG, such as being a consultant to SANDAG or to any party with pending legal actions against SANDAG during their tenure on the ITOC. ITOC members shall not have direct commercial interest or employment with any public or private entity, which receives TransNet sales tax funds authorized by the voters in this Ordinance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Recommends imposing higher taxes on non-business related fuel instead of the local sales tax measure for transportation.</td>
<td>Undated letter from Robert Sheard</td>
<td>While recognizing the need to improve transportation facilities and services, legislators at both the federal and state levels have been reluctant to pass gas tax increases since the early 1990s. The TransNet Extension measure provides a source of funding for critical regional and local congestion relief and other related improvements. In addition, SANDAG has legal authority only for a regional sales tax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>It appears that $6.025 billion of the $14 billion total is dedicated to bus rapid transit (BRT), rail transit, and related programs. This is 43% of the total and not equal to the one-thirds distribution approved by the Board. Please explain the disparity.</td>
<td>E-mail dated 4/21/04 from John Suhr</td>
<td>The estimated funding available for transit is $4.647 billion (34.2%) of the $13.570 billion in net funding (after deductions for bicycle and pedestrian facilities, the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee, and administration). This includes a prorated share of environmental mitigation and financing costs, operating costs, and capital costs with adjustments for the cost of direct access ramps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Recommends that the TransNet extension measure include provisions for developing new technology over the 40-year span, such as automated vehicles and roads, dual-mode vehicles, personal rapid transit, movable freeway barriers to add lanes in the rush direction, a regional central computer controlled traffic signal coordination and synchronization program, etc.</td>
<td>E-mails dated 4/21/04, 4/29/04, and 5/4/04 from John Suhr</td>
<td>Most of the recommendations for advanced technologies already are included in SANDAG’s adopted Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), MOBILITY 2030. For example, a Regional Intermodal Transportation Management Systems Network is being developed; this network will interconnect the region’s local transportation management centers (TM Cs) to help better manage the performance of both local and regional transportation systems. The I-15 Managed Lanes project between SR 163 and Centre City Parkway features a movable barrier to provide increase lane capacity in peak periods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BRT plans call for exclusive express bus lanes taken from general purpose lanes as well as bus signal priority and queue jumpers. These will reduce the carrying capacity of surface roads, create major enforcement problems, and will not reduce traffic congestion.</td>
<td>E-mail dated 4/21/04 from John Suhr</td>
<td>Converting general-purpose lanes to exclusive transit lanes are not proposed. Priority measures such as existing and new high occupancy vehicle (HOV) and managed lanes, signal treatments, and queue jumpers would enable transit vehicles to bypass traffic congestion and improve speeds. This is consistent with one of the RTP policy objectives to provide competitive transit travel times to major job centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The present TransNet plan has not significantly reduced congestion, and several of its projects have not even been completed. What proof can be offered that the proposed extension expenditures will genuinely reduce traffic congestion?</td>
<td>E-mail dated 4/21/04 from John Suhr</td>
<td>All but three projects from the original 1987 measure (eastern ends of SR 52 and SR 76 improvements, and Mid-Coast light rail transit) have been completed, and Section 4(E)(1) of the TransNet Extension Ordinance gives priority to completing these projects. Without the implementation of the projects from the original measure, traffic congestion along our major freeways and highways would be significantly worse. The Congestion Relief projects proposed in the Extension are intended to help alleviate congestion as well as provide alternative commute choices in our major travel corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>If the current plan extends to 2008, why vote in November on what seems to be rushed, poorly conceived plans? Why not take an additional two years, open the planning process up to the public, and create a plan that the public really wants.</td>
<td>E-mails dated 4/21/04, 4/29/04, and 5/4/04 from John Suhr</td>
<td>The Mobility Network from the adopted 2030 RTP was used as the basis for the proposed projects and programs included in the Draft TransNet Extension. The RTP, which was developed over a three-year period, included a comprehensive public outreach and involvement program to engage the public and solicit comments. In addition, telephone surveys and focus groups were conducted to gauge public opinion about the TransNet Extension. Policy discussions about the TransNet Extension have occurred at noticed public meetings of the SANDAG Board of Directors and various committees and working groups, and materials have been widely distributed by mail as well as posted on SANDAG’s Web site. Programming and implementation of each of the major projects requires a multi-year funding commitment. If passage is successful, the TransNet Extension would provide a local funding source beyond 2008. With this funding assurance, SANDAG would be able to continue implementation of major projects between now and 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Telecommuting, teleschooling, and E-commerce need to be positively encouraged, along with staggered work hours in employment centers. Internet access should be universal and subsidized if necessary.</td>
<td>E-mails dated 4/21/04, 4/29/04, and 5/4/04 from John Suhr</td>
<td>These transportation demand management (TDM) strategies are among the recommendations included in the adopted 2030 RTP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Opposes the TransNet Extension because funding will be used for “commuter lanes,” HOV lanes, and other projects that will not directly benefit the majority of the traveling public.</td>
<td>E-mail dated 4/23/04 from George Crissman</td>
<td>The projects, programs, and services included in the Draft TransNet Extension are intended to help alleviate congestion as well as provide competitive commute choices in our major travel corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I am sick of this pathetic traffic. One-half of funding should go to freeways and no more than 10% for Trolley and buses.</td>
<td>E-mail dated 4/23/04 from Glen Krause</td>
<td>See response to comment no. 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>If you want my vote, you will dedicate funds to roads, not commuter rail, not buses, not diamond lanes, but the lanes of the road that were supposed to be built, but have not been.</td>
<td>E-mail dated 4/23/04 from Ron Zehr</td>
<td>See response to comment no. 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Transit trip from Oceanside Transit Center to Park Boulevard and University Avenue took 4 hours and 20 minutes. Will definitely stick with his car after this experience.</td>
<td>Voice message dated 4/23/04 from Kirk Brown</td>
<td>See response to comment no. 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Recommends only 10% of TransNet funds go to public transportation, one-third to streets, and remainder to highways to fix where 98% of the people drive.</td>
<td>Anonymous voice message dated 4/23/04</td>
<td>See response to comment no. 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Does not think that one-third of funding should go to transit; it should be diverted to highways. Build out all 900 miles of freeways. No more money for Trolley and transit. Expand the freeway.</td>
<td>Voice message dated 4/23/04 from Les Smith</td>
<td>See response to comment no. 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The unbuilt 900 miles of freeways is causing traffic congestion and hurting our economy. Unlike me, it affects the poorest like maintenance workers and nannies, who can’t plan their schedules to avoid traffic congestion, and who can’t take the Trolley and train. Need to advance funds to build projects.</td>
<td>Anonymous voice message dated 4/23/04</td>
<td>See response to comment no. 8. The Extension measure anticipates the use of bonding to advance critical capital projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sitting in traffic on a Friday afternoon, I believe 100% should be spent on roads and infrastructure for automobiles.</td>
<td>Voice message dated 4/23/04 from Ed Brand</td>
<td>See response to comment no. 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Meaningful “transit service improvements” cannot be achieved with archaic concepts and hardware. With the advent of the automobile, corner-to-corner or station-to-station service became unacceptable. Everything described in Section 6 (Transit Programs) is archaic and lacking in marketability. The services described will make no noticeable improvement in traffic congestion.</td>
<td>E-mail dated 4/26/04 from Robert J. Hoffman</td>
<td>See response to comment no. 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Clearly the HOV lanes being added are not for general traffic purposes although HOV and SOV will be allowed to enter. The real purpose is to give buses bypass capability on congested freeways. It is curious that mass transit conveyances are expected to solve the congestion problems. The numbers say it isn’t so.</td>
<td>E-mail dated 4/26/04 from Robert J. Hoffman</td>
<td>See response to comment no. 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>“Traffic signal coordination” requires only knowledgeable and skilled effort on the part of Traffic Engineers. The signal controls are already synchronized to the power lines. If they do drift, either the synchronizing circuits have failed or are poorly designed. So all that is required is skilled engineering activity, not a central computer.</td>
<td>E-mail dated 4/26/04 from Robert J. Hoffman</td>
<td>Traffic signal coordination requires more than just traffic engineering knowledge. It also requires improved hardware and software components that make up the Arterial Traffic Management System. This system enables local agencies to better manage traffic by coordinating traffic signal timing and optimizing traffic flow on regional arterials that cross jurisdictional boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Private developer fees are nothing more than a new tax regardless of what euphemism is used.</td>
<td>E-mail dated 4/26/04 from Robert J. Hoffman</td>
<td>Impact fees help ensure that future development will contribute its fair share toward funding and mitigating new traffic impacts. These fee proposals are specific to new development and are not a general tax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I will not vote for the TransNet extension in its current form, way too much for public transportation. The previous TransNet distribution was inadequate. That’s why our freeways are as they are, broken. I seriously doubt you will get the two-thirds required.</td>
<td>Web site posting dated 4/27/04 from Jay Berman</td>
<td>See response to comment no. 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Does the TransNet Extension include the construction of an additional two lanes from I-15 to the Pala Casino and beyond?</td>
<td>E-mail dated 4/27/04 from Raymond O. Johnson</td>
<td>The TransNet proposal includes the widening of SR 76 from Melrose Drive to I-15. Widening of SR 76 to the east of I-15 could potentially be funded through the County of San Diego’s share of the local street and road funding from TransNet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Suggest delaying the vote on the TransNet extension another two years.</td>
<td>E-mails dated 4/29/04 and 5/4/04 from John Suhr</td>
<td>The proposal to submit a plan to the voters in November 2004, if successful, would allow for the acceleration of project implementation through the use of bonding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Not in favor of the extension of the TransNet program, because it will include funding of the Sprinter between Oceanside and Escondido. Feels that the Sprinter is not cost-effective and would not serve major commute destinations. Feels that the Sprinter will add to the existing congestion and traffic delays, such as on Mission Road. Suggests that a train-like bus system makes much more sense and is a lot cheaper.</td>
<td>E-mail dated 4/29/04 from Diane Golden</td>
<td>The Sprinter project is being developed with funding from the existing TransNet program, combined with state and federal funds. The TransNet Extension proposal includes funding for east-west transit improvements in the SR 78 corridor – which could be for future improvements to the Sprinter, such as grade separation projects to address potential traffic flow issues, or for BRT improvements, or some combination of the two. Approximately one-third of the Extension funding is proposed for local jurisdictions, to be used for local street and road improvements to address the congestion on local roadways. The Extension also would provide significant funding for improvements to SR 78, SR 76, I-5 and I-15 in the North County area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Recommends that TransNet allocate more dollars towards transit, land use incentives, bicycling- and pedestrian-oriented projects, and highways that accommodate both transit and multi-passenger vehicles. States that creating a world class transit system will help meet the needs of the region as it grows and as its population ages. Feels that spending a significant amount of TransNet dollars on local roads just does not make sense and is not equitable.</td>
<td>E-mail dated 5/2/04 from Ken Cluskey</td>
<td>The TransNet Extension proposal is a balanced package providing improvements for all modes of transportation. There is significant funding devoted to developing a regionwide BRT network that would utilize the future HOV/managed lanes on most of the major highway corridors. Funding also is included for smart growth incentives and for bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The Local Programs funding provides for ongoing local street and road improvement and maintenance needs, but has been expanded to allow local jurisdictions to use these funds for local transit improvements, integrating BRT services, and additional smart growth-related infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Disagrees with editorial from Supervisor Horn and Supervisor Slater-Price recommending more public funding for new highways. Believes that the pattern of growth development for the past 30-40 years is borderline irresponsible, as it is irresponsible to suggest continuing this pattern via new highway building. Recommends connecting land use and transportation and focusing on better ways of planning and building future neighborhoods, as recommended by County of San Diego staff in the General Plan 2020 update.</td>
<td>E-mail dated 5/3/04 from Howard M. Blackson, III</td>
<td>See response to comment no. 24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Believes that a better expenditure plan is needed for the TransNet Extension to achieve the public’s overwhelming demand for significantly reduced congestion. Recommends increasing funding for highways and local streets and roads, and reducing funding for public transit. Recommends using ramp metering to provide maximum freeway throughput, in lieu of HOV/Managed Lanes.</td>
<td>E-mail dated 5/3/04 from Walt Brewer</td>
<td>See response to comment no. 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Recommends an “improved process and probable governance changes to substitute facts based decisions for those generated by impressions and desires.”</td>
<td>E-mail dated 5/3/04 from Walt Brewer</td>
<td>The Mobility Network from the adopted 2030 RTP was used as the basis for the proposed projects and programs included in the Draft TransNet Extension. MOBILITY 2030 was developed by examining how different land use and transportation network scenarios met regional measures of performance that corresponded to the Plan’s seven policy goals: Mobility, Accessibility, Reliability, Efficiency, Livability, Sustainability, and Equity. While the network scenario that emphasized roadway widenings resulted in fewer miles of congested freeway segments (a measure of Reliability), it underperformed in measures of Livability and Sustainability, and it did not significantly improve travel times (measures of Mobility) compared to the Mobility Network alternative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Request performance data related to the implementation of the proposed major projects in the Draft TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan.</td>
<td>E-mail dated 5/3/04 from Walt Brewer</td>
<td>SANDAG is in the process of conducting travel forecasting model runs to develop these data for the proposed TransNet Extension projects, using the methodology for measuring performance developed for the 2030 RTP (see response to comment no. 27). These performance measure results are expected to be available in June 2004.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>The additional $2,000 impact fee will increase housing unaffordability and should be withdrawn. Infrastructure bonds should paid from the general fund as they used to be.</td>
<td>E-mail dated 5/4/04 from John Suhr</td>
<td>Impact fees help ensure that future development will contribute its fair share toward funding and mitigating new traffic impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Attempts to place an initiative on the ballot to reduce the 67% vote required for passage to 55% should also fail. Any successful plan should have at least 2/3 support; unanimous support would be the ideal goal.</td>
<td>E-mail dated 5/4/04 from John Suhr</td>
<td>Lowering the current two-thirds voter requirement for special purpose taxes, such as for transportation, to a simple majority vote is one the highest priorities of SANDAG’s adopted legislative goals for 2004.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Feels that the TransNet presentation to the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority provided good quantitative facts, but did not touch on the qualitative question, “What have you done to meet the expectations of the population to improve the situation or have you just maintained the status quo?”</td>
<td>E-mail dated 5/4/04 from Rich Martindell</td>
<td>The projects, programs, and services included in the Draft TransNet Extension are based on MOBILITY 2030, SANDAG’s adopted RTP. Implementation of the Plan would not just to maintain the status quo. It would improve mobility in the San Diego region by providing competitive commute choices in our major travel corridors and making better land use-transportation connections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>There should be more emphasis on the movement of people without depending on freeway and major highway expansion to accommodate automobiles. Recommends making public transit system improvements a higher priority in the expenditure plan, such as expanding Coaster services and adding more bus routes to serve more areas. Believes that public transportation systems are more valuable for citizens who find freeways impossible or impassable – such as seniors, students and workers.</td>
<td>Letter dated 5/4/04 from Joy Lane</td>
<td>See response to comment no. 24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>The TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan and current transit plans lack funds and designs for an integrated bus feeder system that will support the Mid-Coast LRT. Connections are needed between the LRT and communities in La Jolla, Pacific Beach, University City, and Clairemont and large employment areas in Sorrento Valley, Mira Mesa, and Miramar Road.</td>
<td>Letter dated 5/5/04 from Daniel Allen</td>
<td>A transit network plan that identifies connecting transit services will be developed in a timeframe closer to the actual opening of the Mid-Coast LRT project. Evaluation of short-term transit improvements in the Mid-Coast corridor (such as bus stop consolidations and routing changes) are underway as part of SANDAG’s ongoing transit service planning and monitoring efforts. Under the Draft TransNet Extension, the allowable uses of the funding under Local Programs has been expanded so that local jurisdictions could use their TransNet funds for local transit improvements, integrating BRT services, and additional smart growth-related infrastructure to support transit connectivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Believes that traffic congestion relief via expansion of freeways and highways that we use to travel to and from work is our greatest transportation need. Urges SANDAG to reconsider expenditure plan to provide more funding for freeway and highway projects.</td>
<td>Letter dated 5/6/04 from David W. Krogh</td>
<td>See response to comment nos. 8 and 24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Recommends TransNet funds be used to pay for public transit and not for roads in new developments.</td>
<td>Undated postcards from Tasha Pruitt, Thomas Mullaney, Julia Minton, and Kevin Reindl of Transit Riders United</td>
<td>See response to comment no. 24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Recommends the addition of left turn lanes, acceleration and deceleration lanes, and signing for SR 67 widening project. Requests that Ramona residents be kept informed when project is designed and developed.</td>
<td>Facsimile dated 5/5/04 from Kristi Mansolf</td>
<td>These design elements are not within the scope of the Draft TransNet Extension Ordinance. These details will be addressed by the project sponsor (Caltrans) as part of implementation of any future SR 67 project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>On May 4, 2004, the Coronado City Council voted unanimously to support the Draft TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan released from comment by SANDAG on April 9, 2004. Acknowledges the efforts of the Ad Hoc Working Group on TransNet, the Transportation Committee, SANDAG staff and advisors, and the Board of Directors on the extension measure. New features, such as the comprehensive transportation corridor planning concept, the Regional Traffic Congestion Improvement Program, integration of environment mitigation and enhancements, and implementation of the Independent Taxpayers Oversight Committee, are important improvements over the current TransNet program.</td>
<td>Facsimile dated 5/5/04 from Mayor Smisek, City of Coronado</td>
<td>Thank you for the support and appreciation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Expresses support for the TransNet Expenditure Plan. Supports retaining consultants rather than hiring additional SANDAG and Caltrans employees for the implementation of TransNet projects, as it is easier to make staffing adjustments with private sector employees than it is with government employees.</td>
<td>Letter dated 5/6/04 from Eugene “Mitch” Mitchell, Vice President, Public Policy &amp; Communications, San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Thank you for the support. Project development and implementation of the transportation improvements in the Draft TransNet Extension will utilize an appropriate balance of private sector consultants and public employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>At the April 27, 2004 City Council meeting, the La Mesa City Council unanimously passed a resolution endorsing the Draft TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan.</td>
<td>Letter dated 5/3/04 from Gregory P. Humora, Engineering Project Manager, City of La Mesa</td>
<td>Thank you for the support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Opposes the TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan because it does not provide a clear, enforceable method to ensure that the three uncompleted projects from the original 1987 measure will be completed before subsequent projects are funded. Expresses concern over the lack of improvements on SR 76 between I-5 and I-15.</td>
<td>Letter dated 5/5/04 from Wes Peet, President, Fallbrook Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Section 4(E)(1) provides priority to completing the three remaining projects from the original measure (eastern ends of SR 52 and SR 76 improvements, and the Mid-Coast light rail transit project). Language is included regarding ensuring sufficient funding or bonding capacity for these three projects. TransNet-funded improvements to the western end of SR 76 have been completed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>